

# THE THINKER:

*A MAGAZINE OF CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.*

VOL. IX.

AUGUST, 1893.

No. 2.

## THE SURVEY OF THOUGHT.

MR. HALCOMBE'S THEORY OF THE SUCCESSION OF THE GOSPELS.—In the year '89 Mr. Halcombe published a book entitled *The Historic Relation of the Gospels*, in which he maintained the somewhat unique position that the Gospel according to St. John was in date of composition, not the fourth, but the first. This work did not secure the attention it deserved, partly, it seems to us, on account of the confused arrangement of the constituent parts. Last year, however, the question was slightly taken up in the *Expository Times*, and this year, since March, month after month has it been assailed and defended. For our own part, we have every sympathy with his view, could it be proved. Could it be shown indisputably that the Gospel which is ascribed to John was written before the Synoptical Gospels, then a whole incubus of criticism would be thrown off at once. We, however, are compelled to confess that, with all the will in the world, we are not yet convinced. It may be our own want of intellect or insight: it is certainly our misfortune, not our fault. We may arrange the proofs he brings forward in support of his theory into two main classes—External and Internal Evidence. The External Evidences are of two classes: first, the order in which the Gospels are placed in different manuscripts of the New Testament and in different lists of the New Testament books; next, the statements of the Muratori fragment, and of Tertullian against Marcion. As to the first of these classes into which we have divided the External Evidence for his view, it seems to us of little value unless it could be shown that chronology was the reason of the order in question, a thing that Mr. Halcombe does not even attempt to show. Moreover, even on his own showing of six lists or manuscripts, not one gives the order he prefers—only two place John first. Not an uncommon order of reference is one which places the two Apostles together before the two *apostolici*, or followers of the Apostles, Mark and Luke—that is to say, the order is logical, not chronological. In the cases where John is put before Matthew, the succession need not be that the date of John's Gospel was earlier than the date of that of Matthew, but because John, as the beloved disciple, had a greater dignity, and, as a matter of history, was much more prominent as an Apostle than was Matthew. Mr. Halcombe's argument, it seems to us, becomes peculiarly weak in regard to Papias. In the confused sentence quoted from him by Eusebius, he says (Bk. III., c. 38): "What was said by Andrew, or by Peter, or by Philip, or by Thomas or James, or by John or Matthew, or any of the Lord's disciples, and what Aristeas and the elder John, disciples

of the Lord, say." We think no one but Mr. Halcombe would see any evidence here that the Gospel of John preceded that of Matthew. Were the fact that John is mentioned before Matthew any evidence that in the Gospel "instrument," as Papias had it, the Gospel of John preceded that of Matthew, then it might be argued that the apocryphal Gospels that go by the name of Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, and James were contained in Papias' "instrument" and preceded those of John and Matthew. We confess to being surprised to find Mr. Halcombe alleging that the Muratori fragment was in favour of his view. The line runs distinctly, "[*Auctor* *quarti evangeliorum Johannis* (es)]." This distinct statement he puts aside by the assumption that "The arrangement of the clauses may have been altered by the translator to bring the order of the Gospels into conformity with the custom of the Church by which the Canon was adopted." If the late Bishop Lightfoot's hypothesis was correct, that the Muratori fragment was translated from the Greek original, which was in iambics, it is difficult to imagine *τριῶτος* occupying the place occupied by *τέταρτος*. Even grant that the translator did not feel himself bound to change his original before he reversed his original's order, still the deductions Mr. Halcombe makes from the text are, it seems to us, unwarranted. The translation of the passage is: "The author of the fourth Gospel is John, from the disciples. He said to his fellow-disciples and the bishops (overseers) urging him, 'Fast with me three days from to-day (*hodie triduum*), and let us relate to each other what is revealed to any one.' The same night it was revealed to Andrew of the Apostles that, all reviewing, John should write all things in his own name." There seems to us (we are sorry to say it) no evidence from this that John's Gospel was written before any other Gospel. There is nothing to show what he was being urged to do. For aught that appears to the contrary, he might have been urged to supplement the omissions of the Synoptic Gospels. Indeed, a fair case might be made out for asserting that the writer of the fourth Gospel was not an "Apostle," but only a "disciple." The whole story, however, is so evidently mythic that no one can really put any stress on it. We are sorry to be obliged to dismiss as equally valueless the evidence Mr. Halcombe alleges from Tertullian. We should be very far from following one of his opponents, Mr. Wright, in undervaluing Tertullian personally as evidence. What we assert is that Tertullian's evidence does not prove Mr. Halcombe's contention. Mr. Halcombe lays great stress on one sentence in Tertullian, "*Denique nobis fidem ex apostolis Johannes et Matthaeus insinuant ex apostolicis Lucas et Marcus instaurant*"—"Then of the Apostles, John and Matthew instil the faith into us, and of the followers of the Apostles Luke and Mark renew it (or, to use Mr. Halcombe's translation, 'confirm it')."  
But this does not support Mr. Halcombe's position even when fortified by *post apostolos* from the preceding sentence. In point of evidence the *apostolici*, of course, came "after," and consequently were inferiors to the Apostles; but because Tertullian maintains this, it does not follow that he maintains

that the Gospels written by the *apostolici*, Luke and Mark, were composed later than those of John and Matthew. Another sentence occurs a little lower which we would render more briefly than Mr. Halcombe. "But how is it, if the Apostles themselves published nothing in order that the disciples should publish, since these could not even have been disciples without the teaching of their masters?" This seems to imply that Tertullian does not contend for priority in the publication of written Gospels by the Apostles John and Matthew, but that being Apostles, their Gospel unwritten must have a priority in point of time over those who had received their Gospel from others who were in Christ before them. While we do not deny that plausible argument could be alleged for maintaining that Tertullian meant to assert that Luke and Mark wrote after the two Apostle evangelists, there is nothing in the passage that compels us to assume that to be his view. If none of the authorities he claims to be on his side are absolutely convincing, Irenæus, who is against him, is clear and distinct. He tells us in the passage quoted by Eusebius (Bk. V. 8), first of the composition of the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke; then adds, "Afterwards John, the disciple of our Lord, the same that lay upon His bosom, also published the Gospel while he was yet at Ephesus in Asia." The testimony of Irenæus is peculiarly valuable, linked to the Apostle John as he was by his master Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. Polycarp would certainly know when his master published his Gospel. Mr. Halcombe endeavours to invalidate this by maintaining that, had this been the ordinary opinion, Irenæus would not have been under the necessity of stating it any more than one nowadays would feel himself called upon to assert that the Duke of Wellington was the victor at Waterloo. The circumstances are not at all parallel. Were the Duke's share in the victory made a subject of controversy, then the assertion of one who had had an opportunity of conversing with Waterloo veterans might be of considerable value. He further attempts to invalidate the testimony of Irenæus by asserting that he declared our Lord to have lived to old age on the authority of tradition. Unfortunately we have only the Latin of the passage in which Irenæus makes the assertion referred to. What he says may be roughly paraphrased, "Up to thirty years is the age of the first and youthful disposition (*indolis*); it extends even to forty; every one will confess that from forty or fifty one begins to decline toward seniority (*seniorem etatem*), which our Lord had while He was teaching." That is to say that, our Lord was between forty and fifty. We must remember that there is nothing in the Gospel history that demonstrates Irenæus to be mistaken here. It has been thought that Irenæus here is making a deduction from two statements in John viii., and not really from verbal tradition. At all events, he means to maintain no more than that our Lord as He had had the "disposition" of youth, so He had also "the disposition" of age by having passed forty, the boundary, in Irenæus' opinion, between youth and age. It is really difficult to see the probative force of Mr. Halcombe's internal evidence. All that he seems to us to prove is that John and the Synoptists are mutually sup-

plementary. While on his assumption that John was first written, it is easy to prove Matthew to be a supplement; another might start with Matthew, and prove John to be the supplement. For our own part, we feel strongly that closer investigation will prove the Gospel of John to be selected portions of a much larger whole; in proof of this we might indicate John iv. 54, "This is again the second sign which Jesus did, having come out of Judea into Galilee." There must have been another sign wrought between our Lord's departure from Judea and the healing of the Capernaum nobleman's son. To discuss this would involve too much time.

MODERN EXPLANATIONS OF RELIGION.—In a very interesting article in *The New World*, Professor Schultz attempts to give an answer to the question, What is Religion? He remarks that it is strange that this question is such a new one—hardly a hundred years old—especially when we take into account the fact that mankind from its earliest stage of culture has considered religion to be the most important of all matters, and that in connection with it the deepest feelings of the human heart have been excited. He points out a striking difference between the pagan and the Christian idea of religion. "The religions of antiquity had little or nothing to do with the inner life of the private individual. They did not oblige him in his own thought to assume a certain position with respect to a strictly developed doctrine. To be religious was to pay to the gods, on whose favour or anger the fate of the nation depended, the reverence which they claimed. The method of expressing this reverence rested upon immemorial traditional customs, the Divine origin of which no one doubted—upon written or unwritten sacred laws. The *doctrine* of the gods was fluid: it would form and reform itself in the mind of poets and philosophers. The piety of the multitude was little inquisitive about it. The *cultus* was fixed and unalterable. It was not the concern of the individual. Independent of his inner life and feeling it was the affair of the community, and therefore a highly important part of civic duty." After discussing the opinions of modern theologians concerning the nature of religion, Professor Schultz announces the decision he himself comes to. "Religion is the free devotion to God which arises through the conviction of the inability of the world to satisfy our spiritual, especially our moral, personality. Its peculiar sphere of life is the feeling of this beatifying and liberating bond. Wherever man actually feels the breath of God, there is religion, under all error and under all moral weakness. Where the feeling of unity with God ceases, there only the shadow of religion remains, a dead faith, a worthless form. But when it is actual feeling, not an imagination of feeling, there must be in it immediately a firm and certain judgment of values; that is, *faith*. It does not need to excite in every man an impulse to theoretical knowledge of Divine things. It may have living power without any trait of philosophy. But *faith* it must bring forth—that is, a firm conviction of the significance of the Divine life for our life in the world. This conviction is not 'certain' in the sense of scientific

certainty; but it is more certain to the pious man than all knowledge, because it directly rises out of the religious feeling itself. The faith of the Christian is the trusting conviction of the revelation of God in the person of Christ. Faith can say nothing concerning God in Himself; only science (metaphysic) can attempt this. It knows God only as He reveals Himself to man; as He makes the world a world of salutations. The revelation of God with which faith has to do cannot consist of imparted knowledge, but of acts through which God effects religion in the soul of the individual or among the peoples; that is, He makes Himself known as the Lord of the world, and the giver of salvation. Only such a conviction, born out of religious feeling, is faith. If religion is an actual feeling, it must bring with it devotion to the will of God. A religion without an impulse to serve God, to testify personal devotion to Him, and to seek communion with Him, there has never been and never can be." It is to be feared, however, that the pagan idea of religion is not yet extinct among us. Something suspiciously like it is discernible in the cases of those who pride themselves upon the vagueness and fluidity of their doctrine, the fixity and unalterableness of their cultus, and their aversion to all statements on the part of others of personal religious experience.

BINDING AND LOOSING.—There are probably many Protestants who never hear or read the words addressed by our Lord to St. Peter without a slight involuntary suspicion that after all there may be something in the Roman Catholic doctrine, that definite powers of absolving and condemning were committed to an official in a visible Church. Fortunately, the Gospels provide us with abundant materials for forming a definite judgment on this very important question. Professor Findlay, in the first of two lectures, republished in a little volume entitled *The Church of Christ* (C. H. Kelly, London), deals with the question in a very lucid manner. He points out that the words concerning binding and loosing were not addressed to the Apostle Peter in any merely personal or official sense, as is clear from their repetition in the plural in Matt. xviii. 18, where they are applied to the relations of ordinary Christian brethren: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." And with these he compares the words spoken, not to the Apostles as such, but to the gathered disciples of the risen Lord, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them: and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained" (John xx-xxii. 23). In explanation of these passages he remarks, "the Church of Christ exerts continually a condemning and absolving influence in each and all of its members, so far as they possess the Spirit of their Head and are in fellowship with Him. Those who share St. Peter's faith share his power. Each confessor of the Son of God is empowered to open to the penitent, so far as human hands may, that gate of faith through which he himself has passed. Each Christian believer, according to the grace and wisdom given

him, in his appointed place, may teach the young and ignorant the law of the Divine kingdom, with its bonds and blessings; and he does it with as good right, with a power as directly conferred by the Spirit of the risen Christ, as any Pope of Rome. These great sayings of the Lord were meant to be the basis, not of the magical powers of a priesthood, but of the moral influence of the fellowship of Christ everywhere. They are fulfilled in every verdict of a sound Christian public opinion, in every word of loving reproof or compassion spoken to an erring Christian brother. By the judgments you pass, by the opinions you express, you are binding or loosing every day; and if those judgments spring from a true faith, and are guided by the Spirit of Christ, they are sealed in heaven and stand good for ever."

THE UNFINISHED TEACHING OF CHRIST.—In a very interesting paper in *The Expository Times* the Rev. F. Relton follows out the line of thought suggested by the striking passage in St. John's Gospel, in which Christ says to His Apostles, "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now" (xvi. 12). His contention is that, while in the teaching of Christ as reported in the Gospels we have a unique and priceless heritage, which cannot be added to, the living voice of the living, ascended, and indwelling Christ still speaks to us in history, in science, in poetry, in the Church, and in the silence of our own conscience. "There were many things that the Christ wished to say to His Apostles, and things concerning the Church, her doctrine, her sacraments; concerning the world and its woes; concerning the future life and destiny of mankind. But He did not say them. Have they, therefore, been left entirely unsaid? Has the silence never been again broken?" Some have ventured to answer these queries in a very bold and complete manner. They have interpreted the general statement of Acts i. 3 as sanctioning the opinion that in the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension our Lord said the things He had forborne to say before His passion, and gave minute and accurate details of Christian doctrine, of the organization of the Christian Church, and of the full and complete programme of Christian civilization. The futility of this supposition is easily shown. The Apostles were then but very little better able to bear all that the Christ had to tell them than they were during the days of the passion-week. As Mr. Relton points out, it was only gradually and slowly that the Christian Church freed itself from Jewish environments. To have said to the Apostles, "You must cease to be Jews; you must become universal, as I am universal," would have thoroughly disheartened and disconcerted them. They would not have borne such teaching at first, but at last the lesson was learned, and this by means of the continued utterance of the voice of the living Christ. In like manner the abolition of slavery was undoubtedly part of the Christian programme. Yet in the historic teaching of Christ there is no allusion to it. "But Christ gave the principle of human brotherhood, and slavery was doomed from the moment that Roman citizen, freedman, and slave knelt together at the altar and confessed

a common allegiance to Christ and a common love to man. The recognition of all that this involved was a matter of many centuries. But it stands among the many things Christ had to tell the Church as she was able to bear it." So, again, with regard to Christian doctrine. The Sermon on the Mount does not contain the whole of Christ's teaching even in outline. Development of Christian theology and doctrine could not set in until the earthly work of Christ was ended. As a mere matter of fact, the last book of our New Testament—the Gospel of St. John—contains the profoundest theology. "The Lord had, indeed, much to tell the Apostles concerning Christian doctrine, but they could not then bear it or understand it. It was to be gradually taught to them (and to us) as their life and work demanded it, and as their capacity for understanding God's purposes grew and became stronger with exercise and knowledge and increased power." In the concluding part of his paper Mr. Belton has much to say that is well worth reading with regard to the important question as to how we are to recognize the living voice of the living Christ.

EXISTING THEOLOGICAL TENDENCIES.—In a very interesting lecture delivered in Edinburgh, Professor Orr discussed the theological situation. He pointed out that it is a most remarkable feature of the times that with what looked like a revolution against theology, there never had been such a searching and deep-seated interest in theological questions. There was bound to be great development and change in the forms by which the truth of the Gospel was expressed—what was called progress in theology, which many, unwise he thought, looked upon with suspicion and distrust. The forms of one age had to be broken up in order that new ones might be created more in keeping with the thought and tendencies of the time. If that were more clearly perceived and freely acknowledged, the present strain in the theological position would be considerably relieved. Proceeding to speak of the main currents which give a direction and character to the theology of our own time, Professor Orr said he would specially indicate four. The first was the current flowing through theology from Old Testament criticism. This had occasioned much disquiet, but the lecturer showed that the result of the Old Testament critical movement was to lay the foundations of a broader apologetic by bringing out the essential difference between the religion of Israel and all other religions. The question now is not, Is the Bible a miraculously preserved book, but, Was Israel a miraculously preserved race? The second current was that flowing in from science in the general acceptance of the idea of evolution. Evolution, he said, was an idea which had laid hold upon the age with a fascination which was in danger of becoming a superstition. The place where it specially struck into theology was in connection with the doctrine of sin. Jesus was apt to appear simply as the apex of the evolutionary movement, and redemption as only aid rendered to the race in its upward march of progress by a great and good personality. But science was already beginning to

distinguish between evolution and Darwinism, and to recognize that evolution admitted of new starting-points, and did not invariably proceed by insensible modifications. What was true and proved in evolution was not incompatible with anything in Christianity. A third main influence in theology was certain powerful currents reaching us from Germany, and associated with the name of Ritschl. The watchwords of this influential school, so far as it affected theology in our country, were theology without metaphysics, a return to the historic Christ, and the idea of the kingdom of God. A fourth main influence was the social spirit of the age. Few are better qualified than Professor Orr to deal with the subject in question, and to treat in a lucid and suggestive manner the diverse influences which are moulding and forming the theological thought of our time.

## BIBLICAL THOUGHT.

### THE DIASPORA IN EGYPT.

By REV. P. HAY-HUNTER.

In the year 527 Cambyses made Egypt a Persian province, and so it remained, with short interludes of independence, until it passed under the sceptre of Alexander the Great. This meant for Palestine nearly two hundred years of peaceful obscurity, during which the development of Judaism went on undisturbed from without. The death of Alexander (323) let loose the forces of discord and confusion anew. The ancient rivalry between Egypt and Asshur was revived, on a less gigantic scale, but with consequences scarcely less disastrous to Jewish tranquillity. One Greek dynasty established itself on the Nile, another on the Euphrates. Equally to the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, the possession of the strip of Palestinian coast, and of the highlands commanding it, was a vital necessity; without that, neither had a frontier for defence or a vantage-ground for attack. Hence a war, or rather series of wars, between the Greek lords of Egypt and of Syria, into which the Jews were dragged in spite of themselves. Once more their land was fated to become the highway of invading armies, the battleground of contending kings.

In the beginning of the struggle the advantage lay with the Ptolemies. The founder of the Lagid dynasty, Ptolemy Soter, seized Jerusalem by a *coup de main* (c. 320), and vigorously asserted his supremacy over southern Syria. The second Ptolemy, Philadelphus (286-246), pushed his conquests in this region still further, up to the gates of Damascus; and the third, Euergetes (246-222), kept his Asiatic possessions undiminished. During these three reigns, which covered a hundred years, Judea—with brief intervals of Syrian domination—remained a fief of the Egyptian crown.

The outstanding feature of Jewish history during this century is the

phenomenal growth of the Diaspora in Egypt. No doubt there had always been less or more of a Jewish population in that country; one finds traces of a tendency to return to the land from which they had originally come. At the time of the Chaldaean conquest a multitude of refugees had fled thither, taking the prophet Jeremiah with them. In all probability, a considerable number of Jews had passed into Egypt in the track of the Persian armies. Josephus states that Jewish soldiers, who had followed Alexander the Great in his campaigns, were settled in the newly-founded Alexandria with full rights of citizenship. But it was during the reigns of the first Ptolemies that the stream of emigration from Judea set in on a great scale. When Ptolemy Soter took Jerusalem, he carried home with him, as prisoners of war, a large number of Jewish families—according to Aristeas (*apud* Josephus), not less than 100,000 souls; of whom 30,000 chosen men were drafted into the army, while the rest were distributed as serfs among the Greek lords of the soil. Later in the same reign there took place a voluntary emigration; according to Hecataeus (as quoted by Josephus), "not a few myriads removed into Egypt," under the leadership, apparently, of one Hezekiah, a member of the high-priestly house. The second Ptolemy, Philadelphus, is said to have emancipated the Jewish serfs, in number about 120,000, at a cost, borne by the royal treasury, of 460 talents.

Unfortunately, these statements rest on no other authority than that of Josephus, and Josephus is not to be trusted, even when he professes to quote from Greek historians; for we have no guarantee either that he quotes correctly, or that the Greek writers whom he calls as independent witnesses to the past grandeur of his nation were not themselves Alexandrian Jews masquerading under well-known names. Still, when every allowance is made for exaggeration and embellishment, the sketch he gives of the relations between his people and the Greek sovereigns of Egypt may be accepted as fairly accurate. One can easily appreciate the motives of policy which led the Ptolemies to encourage the settlement of a large Hebrew population in their dominions. It has been suggested that they may have hoped to bring about by this means a *rapprochement* between the native Egyptians and the dominant Greeks, the Jews having something in common with both races—with the Egyptians, for example, their practice of circumcision and distinction between clean and unclean animals; with the Greeks, their belief in the Divine unity and spirituality. (So Holtzmann in his *Ende des jüdischen Staatswesens*.) But probably the Ptolemies understood the materials they had to work with too well to expect any such result from the importation of this third nationality into Egypt; indeed, they can scarcely have desired it. The Jews were valuable to them as subjects, precisely because they held aloof from other peoples, entrenched behind the barrier of their Law. They might be depended upon as a make-weight against the forces of disaffection. They helped to populate Alexandria. They furnished Ptolemy with garrisons for his fortresses, with soldiers for his armies, with colonists for Cyrene and other places in Libya, where they

w  
it  
w  
m  
J  
p  
a  
J  
of  
fa  
w  
of  
es  
cu  
w  
fo  
Th  
a  
ch  
ap  
th  
th  
qu  
sa  
wi  
or  
tic  
ke  
no  
be  
ch  
riv  
pr  
of  
al  
th  
An  
dy  
th  
sa  
th  
tic

were useful in guarding the frontier of the realm. Besides this, the existence of a great Jewish community at the seat of government gave the king a certain hold over Judæa. By the favour he showed to the Egyptian Jews he might hope to conciliate the good-will of the Palestinians, and in the event of the latter wavering in their allegiance it was to his advantage that he held so many of their countrymen as hostages under his hand.

This Egypt of the Ptolemies, which the magical touch of the Hellenic genius had stimulated into new life, intellectual and commercial, held out many attractions to Jewish emigrants. Already the limits of their own land had grown too narrow, probably for the natural increase of the population, certainly for the energies of the race. "Hiving off" had become almost a necessity. Theirs was comparatively a poor country. They were "invited to Egypt," says Josephus, "by the excellency of the soil." They were invited also by the traffic of the great seaport, which had more than realized its founder's dream, and was fast taking its place as the mart of the world. At home the conditions of life were manifestly insecure. Placed, as they were, between the rival ambitions of powerful monarchs, without any desire to take sides, but too weak to maintain neutrality, the people of Judæa could scarcely view the political outlook without apprehension. It was natural that many of them should say, as their forefathers had said in Jeremiah's time, "We will go into the land of Egypt, where we shall see no war, nor hear the sound of the trumpet, nor have hunger of bread; and there will we dwell" (Jer. xlii. 14). In these days there was no prophet to rebuke such words and forbid the sacrilege of emigration. The prospect of material welfare proved too strong for the sentiment, at once pious and patriotic, which bound the Jew to the land of his fathers—the "holy land." The development of Judaism as a system of religious thought and life had this among its consequences—that it favoured the growth of a wider Israel than the borders of Judæa could contain. Expatriation no longer meant complete forfeiture of religious privileges. The Jewish emigrant left the Temple behind, but wherever he went he carried with him the Torah and the ritual of the synagogue. And in Egypt, under the tolerant rule of its Greek kings, he might live as his Law prescribed and worship in his synagogue unmolested.

So the descendants of those who had returned from the Babylonian Captivity two centuries before went forth in great numbers into voluntary exile, and thronged and multiplied exceedingly in the rich lands of the Delta and beside the busy wharves of Alexandria. The Jewish population in Egypt, in the time of the fourth Ptolemy, is estimated by Philo at a million. Most of these were settled in the capital, where their genius for affairs had full scope. There was no Ghetto or Pale in Alexandria, but the Jews naturally drew together, and of the five quarters or wards of the city—designated by the first five letters of the Greek alphabet—they occupied almost exclusively the quarter Delta, where the harbour was situated. This Jewish community had its merchants, freighters, and ship-captains, in

whose hands was largely, perhaps mainly, the export trade of Alexandria ; its craftsmen, among whom the Talmud mentions, as notable for their skill, workers in the precious metals, smiths, armourers, and weavers ; its government officials, collectors of revenue, and "watchers of the Nile." To the Jew, ambitious of distinction, there was open a career at court or in the profession of arms. The fighting qualities of the race seem to have been appreciated by the army leaders of that age, and—if the statements of Josephus are correct—more than one of his countrymen rose to positions of high command in the Egyptian military service.

As regards their political status, the Jews in Egypt were exceptionally favoured. It may be doubted whether they ever really had the *isopoliteia*, which would have placed them on an equal footing with the Greek masters of the land. But unquestionably they enjoyed considerable privileges : "the establishment of their own tribunals, the free exercise of their religious customs, and the suspension or alteration of any local law which interfered with or ran counter to them" (Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures*, p. 364). They formed a practically separate community under a ruler of their own race. This dignitary, elsewhere styled Ethnarch, was known in Egypt as Alabarch, a mongrel word of uncertain meaning. The Alabarch was presumably chosen by the people themselves out of some rich and noble family, his appointment being, of course, subject to the royal approval. He collected the taxes and paid them into the state exchequer ; represented his people in their relations with the government ; and at the same time decided all questions arising among them out of their own law. At a later period, a sanhedrin of seventy members, modelled on that at Jerusalem, sat in council with the Alabarch at Alexandria ; but at what date this institution had its origin is unknown.

Josephus claims for his countrymen that they stood high in the estimation of their Gentile rulers because they were "found most faithful in the keeping of oaths and covenants." Situated as they were in Egypt, this was no special virtue. They have every reason to be loyal. They were not beloved by the Greeks, who had nothing but contempt for their most cherished and hallowed customs, and who found them besides formidable rivals in trade. They were simply detested by the native Egyptians. The priest Manetho's venomous caricature of Jewish history gives the measure of the hatred which was felt by the conquered race for those creatures of an alien despotism. For their wealth, their privileges, their very existence, they depended on the royal protection. They were "the King's Jews." And they repaid the favours of the first Ptolemies by a devotion to the dynasty which stood the strain even of subsequent persecution.

During this century the relations between the Palestinian Jews and their brethren in Egypt were close and constant. Both lived under the same sceptre. The first Ptolemies were statesmen as well as soldiers, and they governed Judæa, as they governed Egypt, by a wise policy of conciliation. No attempt was made to impose Hellenic customs or institutions on

the subject people. Their religion was respected, even honoured ; the Greek ruler of Egypt sent rich gifts to the temple at Jerusalem, as he did to the temples at Thebes and Memphis. The Jews had to pay a fixed and moderate tribute. They had to refrain from entering into relation with the enemies of Egypt. Otherwise they were as free as at any period of their history. So far, there was nothing in the political situation to loosen the bond between the two communities. There were probably few families at Jerusalem which had not kinsfolk in Alexandria. Leading men of Judæa took their daughters to Alexandria, with a view to finding eligible husbands for them there (*Ant.* xii. 4, 6). The Diaspora was constantly receiving fresh recruits from the mother country, and the infusion of these more recent emigrants counteracted to some extent the effect of time and distance in weakening the attachment of the second or third generation of the colonists to the home of their race. Above all, the temple at Jerusalem visibly represented the idea of national unity, and the festivals of the Mosaic system enabled the scattered sons of Israel to realize that idea for themselves. To carry out the requirements of the Law in their integrity by going thrice in the year to worship at Jerusalem, was, of course, impossible for Jews of the Dispersion. The great majority of them could not look forward to more than one such visit in a lifetime. But it was the dream of the pious Israelite to take that journey at least once, to see for himself the holy city, and to worship in the courts of Jehovah ; and it would be difficult to over-estimate the influence of these pilgrimages in deepening and quickening the consciousness of Jewish solidarity. In a less degree the same end was served by the collection of the poll-tax for the service of the temple. In every community of the Jews abroad each man paid his yearly assessment, his *didrachmon*, for the maintenance of the sanctuary and priesthood ; and Philo (*de Monarch.* ii. 3) relates how, at Alexandria, these dues were deposited in a sacred treasure-chest, and how "sacred messengers" (*ἱεροπομποί*)—men worthy of the honour—were chosen to carry the tribute to Jerusalem.

But more powerful than all these influences which made for unity was the tendency of the two communities to drift apart. As the Diaspora in Egypt grew in numbers, in wealth, and in education, it became less inclined to own the superiority and submit to the control of Jerusalem. The offshoot, which had at first drawn all its life from the parent stem, was now taking independent root and flourishing. To the Alexandrian Jews, who were playing a conspicuous part in the crowded, many-sided life of their adopted country, Jerusalem, while in one respect the holy city, was in another only a petty provincial town. They lived at the centre of civilization, and Judæa lay on its circumference. The influence of Hellenism was brought to bear on them directly and potently. The magnificent patronage of the Ptolemies had made Alexandria the home of learning, the resort of the most distinguished *savants* of the age. To men of the Jewish race, so richly endowed with mental gifts, it was impossible to stand aside from the clash and stir of all this intellectual activity ; they lived in an atmosphere of scientific

curiosity, of literary criticism, of philosophic disquisition, and they breathed it à *pleins poumons*. While the sopherim of Palestine were trifling over minute points of legal casuistry, the leaders of Jewish thought in Egypt were drinking deep at the fountain of Greek philosophy. The "wisdom of Javan," proscribed by the rabbis in Judæa, was eagerly sought after in Alexandria.

The translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek is a significant proof of this increasing detachment from the Judaism of Judæa. The worthless legend which has given this celebrated version its familiar name of "Septuagint" is in no point more absurd than in this, that it represents the seventy (mythical) translators to have been sent from Jerusalem to Alexandria under the authority of the High Priest. The translation was a product of Egyptian Judaism, in which Palestine had no hand at all. Whether Ptolemy Philadelphus had anything to do, directly or indirectly, with the undertaking is extremely doubtful; but in any case it is quite certain that the work was not done at a stroke, to fill up a gap in that monarch's famous library. The men who laid the foundation of the new version by turning the Five Books of Moses into Greek are unknown. Their labours may, perhaps, have begun in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and probably went on for not less than half a century before the Pentateuch stood complete in its new dress. A work of this kind could only have been undertaken in answer to a popular demand. The Egyptian Diaspora spoke Greek, or at any rate a kind of Greek; they read Greek, and understood it much more easily than they read and understood Hebrew; and naturally they desired to have their Law in an intelligible form, for use either in the synagogue or in the home. There were few sopherim—professional exponents of the Law—in Egypt, which made this need felt all the more. No doubt the Jewish pride of race had its share also, and a considerable share, in the movement which resulted in the Septuagint version. The Jews desired to explain and justify themselves to the Gentiles among whom their lot was cast. Alexandria, in the days of the Ptolemies, was the arena for competing philosophies and theosophies, rival claimants for the possession of the truth. The Jews claimed to have the truth in their keeping. They had no mind to continue as a misunderstood and despised sect, circling in a backwater of the intellectual current of the time. So, in the Pentateuch done into Greek, they published the history of their origin, and exhibited their credentials to the heathen world. They deliberately provoked a controversy, out of which they came not without honour.

The strict Judaic party in Palestine had no sympathy with such aims. They could not but look with disapproval on such a daring departure from the old lines as this rendering of the Torah of Moses into the tongue of the uncircumcized. To them it seemed at once a desecration, and the first step in a process of denationalization. Tradition says that the Alexandrians kept the day when the Septuagint was given to the world as a popular festival, with great rejoicings; while the Palestinians, by way of counter demonstration, proclaimed a fast on that day as a *dies ater*, comparable to

the day on which Israel had worshipped the golden calf. Unquestionably, the immediate effect of the new version was to accentuate the difference and to widen the rift between the two communities.

Perhaps the erection of the great Synagogue at Alexandria may have had some share in the process of alienation. It was at all events a sign of the spirit of independence which prevailed among the Diaspora. The Egyptian Jews had boundless wealth at their command; they had also skilled workers in the arts and crafts: on several occasions, by request of the home authorities, craftsmen had been sent from Alexandria to Jerusalem to repair and embellish the temple. It was, consequently, within their power to erect a building for the purpose of worship so vast in its proportions and so splendid in its decorations that it might vie with the temple itself. Philo speaks of the edifice as "most great and notable." In the Talmud it is said: "Who has not seen the Double Hall of Alexandria has never seen the glory of Israel. It was like a great basilica, one Hall behind another; at times there were within it twice as many people as came out of Egypt,"—with other marvellous details of its immense size and costly furnishings. The Alexandrians were naturally proud of their synagogue, and while they continued to pay their dues to the Temple at Jerusalem, where only sacrifice could be offered, gave it only a secondary place in their regard. According to a statement in the Talmud, an epistle sent from the home authorities to the heads of the community in Egypt, about 100 B.C., opened with the scornful greeting: "From Jerusalem the Great to Alexandria the Little." The statement may be accepted so far as it illustrates the reciprocal feeling of the two communities—emulation on one side and jealousy on the other.

The never-ending conflict between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids resulted in the yet more complete separation of the Western Jews from their kindred in Palestine. For nearly a century, under the suzerainty of Egypt, Judæa had enjoyed local autonomy and almost unbroken peace. But, in spite of all the favour shown them by the Egyptian kings, their scrupulous non-interference with native customs and institutions, there is evidence, towards the close of the reign of the third Ptolemy (Euergetes, 246-222), of the rise of an anti-Egyptian and pro-Syrian party among the Judæans. It is difficult to account for this spirit of disaffection, or to imagine what they hoped to gain by a change of masters; but the fact is certain. When the high priest Onias II., some time before the year 222, refused to make payment of the annual tribute to the Egyptian crown, Josephus explains the refusal as the outrageous folly of an avaricious old man. The explanation will scarcely serve when the incident is looked at in the light of after-events. There is, no doubt, an element of truth in the highly-coloured picture drawn by the Jewish historian of the rival kings of Egypt and Syria outbidding each other in the attempt to secure the good-will of the Jewish people. Antiochus the Great, for example, is said to have invited the Jews to settle in Antioch, the new Seleucid capital on the Orontes, and to have conferred upon them the same

civic rites that the Alexandrians enjoyed under the Ptolemies. In his wars against the fourth Ptolemy (Philopator, 222-205), Antiochus had at least the sympathy of a powerful party among the Jews. The high priest Simon, called the Just, seems to have shown a friendly disposition towards the Seleucid king, who had made himself master of Cœle-Syria and Palestine. But the issue was not yet decided; the lordship over Judæa had not yet changed hands. Philopator inflicted a heavy defeat on his rival at Raphia (217), recovered his lost provinces, and appeared in person at Jerusalem. There, in a single day, by one ill-considered act, he undid all that had been effected by the policy of a hundred years. Irritated by the intrigues of the partizans of Syria, determined to teach the Jews a lesson and to show them who was their master, he insisted, against the prayers and protests of Simon and the priests, on forcing his way into the Holy of Holies. This outrage on Jewish feeling could never be forgotten or pardoned. It made an end of all allegiance to the Ptolemaean dynasty. When next Antiochus appeared before Jerusalem, the city opened its gates to him, the citizens made him welcome, and even assisted his soldiers in putting the Egyptian garrison to the sword. Henceforward it was to Antioch, and no longer to Alexandria, that the Judæans looked as the centre of the political system to which they belonged. By preference as by necessity, the Egyptian Jews continued faithful to the Ptolemies. The breach between the two communities was now all but complete. The story of the bold attempt to remove the last link between them by giving to the Diaspora all that it needed for absolute independence—namely, a high priest and a temple of its own—will form the subject of another article.

**THE HEBREW OF DANIEL COMPARED WITH THAT  
OF BEN SIRA.**

BY REV. J. E. H. THOMSON, B.D.

LET us suppose ourselves placed at the end of another millennium, and that we are living not at the end of the nineteenth, but at the end of the twenty-ninth century. Another cataclysm, like that which befell the world when the Roman Empire succumbed to barbarian assaults, and the whole literature of classic days was submerged, has swept over the civilized world. English literature has to a great extent disappeared, only a few stray works are left floating *rari nantes in gurgite vasto*. Let us suppose that *Piers the Ploughman*, in the strange haphazard of events, has drifted to the shores of the new civilization along with Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, the poems of Dante Rossetti and Robert Browning, accompanied perhaps by a few marked fragments of William Morris. The works of the glories of English literature—Shakespeare, Spenser, Milton—have shared a common forgetfulness with Dryden, Pope, Goldsmith. If at this point of time a single copy of one of the *Canterbury Tales* were discovered, critics would be at a loss

to place it. A plausible number of linguistic arguments might be brought forward to prove that it was nearly of the age of Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*; the difference of its vocabulary from that of *Piers the Ploughman*, the presence of rhyme, and so on. Some observing evidences of French influence might be strongly inclined to place it in the reign of Charles II., when French influence was known to be so strong on the Court and in the country. Such arguments on the part of the critics of the twenty-ninth century in regard to the Prologue and the *Knight's Tale* are nearly exactly parallel with the arguments by means of which nineteenth-century critics would place the Book of Daniel in the days of the Maccabees. Works in Hebrew that could be asserted as indubitably belonging to the later Persian and Greek periods of Jewish history have as utterly perished as we have imagined all English literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth century to have done. True, some critics place a considerable number of the books in this period which tradition had regarded as much more ancient. We can easily parallel this by imagining Gower's *Confessio Amantis*, or some portion of it, extant along with *Piers the Ploughman*, and recognized to be nearly contemporary with it, and that the defenders of the late date of the *Knight's Tale* on its discovery at once declared the *Confessio Amantis* late also.

Formerly when critics brought forward a number of words in Daniel of Persian origin, and words that could be paralleled only with words in Chronicles, Nehemiah, Ezra, and Esther, that were there assumed to have originated in the Persian period, they somehow seemed to think these confirmed the conclusion they had arrived at from other considerations that Daniel originated in the days of the Maccabees, about a century and a half after the Persian Empire was overthrown. The obvious *non sequitur* here naturally induced a change of view; as Daniel could not be regarded as early, all these books must be regarded as late, and originating in the days of the Hellenic domination. This, as we have said, would be paralleled by our thirtieth-century critic declaring the *Confessio Amantis* late, in order to defend his assertion that the Prologue to the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Knight's Tale* are so. On the other hand, the confirmation to the ordinary critical view that is supposed to be got from the lexical and grammatical differences between Daniel and the post-Exilic prophets is paralleled by the differences in language, grammar, ideas, and versification between Chaucer and *Piers the Ploughman*. Is not the value of such comparisons greatly lessened when, by comparing the Chigi text with that of the Masoretic, we discover that Daniel has been repeatedly edited and interpolated? Before any word or phrase in the Hebrew or Aramaic portions of Daniel is admitted as proof of the lateness of the original work, it must be shown that it was present in both texts. Even then there is the possibility that the process which has been carried on *after* the separation of these two texts had been going on *before*.

It does not require much further strain to imagine the result on the theorizing critics we have above supposed if *Alexander's Feast* or

*Absolom and Achitophel* were found in some half-charred copy in the ruins of the British Museum. Even if there were unearthed quotations from these poems in the prose of days yet future to us, there would be some difficulty experienced to maintain the date our imaginary critics had assumed for Chaucer. If we neglect for the present the Aramaic of Daniel and reserve it for future consideration, we can say that something like this is the state of matters in regard to his Hebrew. We have not, unfortunately, discovered the original Hebrew of any books composed during the Greek period; but we have, fortunately, a very considerable number of quotations from the most voluminous among them—the Book of Ecclesiasticus.

There has never been a doubt that the original tongue of Ecclesiasticus was one or other of the two Semitic languages common in Palestine—the words of the prologue to the Greek translation render that nearly incontestable. The fact that the Rabbinic quotations from this work are generally given in Hebrew, even when the work in which they are quoted is written in Aramaic, is decisive. One writing in English might, if he wished to quote Goethe's *Faust*, either translate for himself the words he wished, or take advantage of another translator, or, not unlikely, give it in the German in which it had been composed. A German, however, would never think, in a German work, of availing himself of an English version of his national poet when he wished to quote from him. In Hebrew, then, Ecclesiasticus was written.

The date at which it was composed has become a subject of controversy, one party placing it about the year 280 B.C., the other a century later. The controversy is at once interesting and important from the bearing it has on the question of the date of the Canon and the light it throws on the methods of the critical school. It would, however, take us too far afield to pursue this discussion into all its windings. Suffice it if we, for our part, feel the weight of probability decidedly in favour of the early instead of the late date. It is not a matter of great importance for our present argument, as in such a case as a collection of proverbs like Ecclesiasticus a century is a negligible quantity. Many of the proverbs might have been handed down from antiquity, and even the most recent would tend to assume an archaism of language to gain them vogue. For this compare *Poor Richard* of Benjamin Franklin and Spurgeon's *John Ploughman's Talk*. At all events, even 180 B.C. is earlier than the received critical date of Daniel. If we, then, compare the passages from Ben Sira—to give the author his Rabbinic name—that have come down to us with Biblical Hebrew, we shall expect to find a resemblance to the Hebrew of Daniel, and differences only the same in number and degree from the rest of Scripture.

The quotations from Ben Sira which occur in Rabbinic writings have been collected several times. We shall make use of the collection of Leopold Dukes in his *Blumenlese*, and that of Schechter in the *Jewish Quarterly*

for June, 1891. Dr. Ginsburg has given a list in his article "Ecclesiasticus" in Kitto's *Bible Dictionary*. The number of these quotations is not great, amounting in all to what would make a somewhat long chapter. Yet there is enough for our purpose. A single scene of Goldsmith's *Good Natured Man* would prove it not to be written in the same age as Peele's *Old Wives' Tale*. Of course there are variations, as may be expected, when we have to do with quotations occurring in different works. We know the variations that are manifest in quotations among ourselves. In cases of difference, the more archaic the form of the language, the more likely it is to be an accurate quotation. And other things being equal, a quotation in the Talmud is more likely to be accurate than one found in a later source. It is to be noted that the quotations are made from the *book of Ben Sira*—"as it is written in the Book of Ben Sira," is the regular formula of citation; they are not traditional sayings handed down from teachers, as are most of the sentences in the Talmud.

We are not dependent merely on the Greek version when we wish to test these Talmudic quotations; there are other two versions that seem to have been made originally from the Hebrew text, though possibly modified by the influence of the widely known Greek—we mean the Latin of the Vulgate and the Syriac of the Peshitto. These have been used with great skill by Professor Margoliouth to find out the original Hebrew text. One may be permitted to doubt the correctness of his conclusions in regard to the versification he fancies he discovers without thereby doubting the validity of the arguments by which he proves New Hebrew to have been the dialect of Hebrew in which Ecclesiasticus was written. By help of these two versions, especially by means of their blunders, we can often verify the Rabbinic form of the verse or verses in question.

Although, as we have said, the number of these quotations is not great, yet it would occupy too much time and space to investigate them *seriatim* as carefully as the case deserves, we shall therefore select. If one looks over the list of quotations brought together by Dr. Schechter he cannot fail to notice some that neither claim to be by Ben Sira nor bear such a resemblance to any passage in *Ecclus.* as to justify the attribution of them to its author; these we would at once exclude from consideration. Next, there are passages that are attributed to Ben Sira, but are not found in any of the extant versions. Some of these may be genuine, and confirm the suspicion suggested by the portions which are found only in the Syriac and Latin that the younger Siracides selected, as well as translated, the proverbs of his grandfather; but some of them are indubitably spurious. On account, therefore, of this doubt we shall omit all reference to them. There is yet a third case where the proverbs quoted, while not attributed to Ben Sira, are in close accordance with passages in *Ecclus.* These are more important, as they may represent proverbs of an earlier date than our author's. Still, they may have been more liable to change when not avowedly extracted from the actual book. There remains a small number of quotations which claim to

be by Ben Sira, and which we can verify as in *Eccl.* in all the versions, and to these last we will restrict ourselves.

The first of these is the fourth of the quotations cited by Dr. Schechter, and eighth of Dukes, it occurs in *Hagigah* 13 (a), the twelfth tractate of *Seder Moed*, the second division of the Talmud. It is quoted also with some variations in *Bereshith Rabbah*, and *Yalkut* on *Job*. We shall, however, follow the Talmudic form—

במופלא מפרק אל תדרוש ובמוכסחה כפרק אל תחקור בכה ש  
הוֹרְשֵׁת הַתְּבוּנָה אֲזִין לְךָ עַמְקָה בְּנִסְתּוֹרוֹת—  
*Eccl.* iii. 21, 22.

"Into that which is too wonderful for thee do not search; into that which is veiled from thee do not inquire. Upon that which is permitted reflect; thou hast no business with secret things." The Greek agrees fairly with this, as do also the Syriac and the Latin; the last, however, being, as not infrequently, pleonastic.

When we compare this sentence with Biblical Hebrew we at once feel how far removed we are even from the language of Nehemiah and Esther—the language, that is to say, of Daniel. The first word is the Hophal participle of the verb נִפְלָא, the Hophal conjugation of that verb is not used in Biblical Hebrew. The Niphal is the usual form it assumes, and in this conjugation it twice occurs in the Book of Daniel; it also, though more rarely, is used in the Hiphil. The opening word of the next clause נִכְנָה is Pual participle of the verb נִכַּה; although the Pual participle occurs twice, it never occurs in the sense of *concealments*, it is simply *covering*, in the most ordinary sense of the word. The following clause begins with a construction that has no example in Daniel or in any other Biblical writing save *Ecclesiastes*, זֶה, "that which"; in Daniel זֶה, not זֶה, is the relative. Further זְמַנֵּי, "to permit," while frequent in Rabbinic Hebrew does not occur in the Bible. The ruling word in the remaining clause is בְּנִסְתּוֹרָה, a word unknown to Biblical Hebrew; it means "business." The Greek translator had this word before him for *xpēia*, the word he uses had that meaning in the days when he wrote (see *Polybius* iii. 45, 2), the Syriac is *tucolna*, "confidence," as if the translator had misread the word as בְּנִסְתּוֹרָה. Thus in the four clauses which form the two verses above quoted there are two words that are not Biblical Hebrew—a verb, besides, that is used in a conjugation not used in Biblical Hebrew; another, although used in the conjugation is not used in the sense. Lastly, there is a construction which while found in *Ecclesiastes* is certainly not found in Daniel, or in any other book of the Hebrew Scriptures.

To show that our conclusion is not based merely on one passage, we shall proceed to the seventh example of Dr. Schechter's list, the next that satisfies all our requirements. It is a quotation of *Eccl.* xlii. 9, 10, and is found in *Sanhedrin*, the fourth tractate in the fourth division or *Seder* of the Talmud—a passage that is all the more interesting because it is

assigned as a reason why the book of Ben Sira is excluded from the Canon. The Hebrew of the passage is as follows:—

בְּתַלְמִידָה מִתְמֻמָּה שָׂמָא מִפְרָחָה לֹא יִשְׁן בְּלִילָה בְּקַמְבָּתָה שָׂמָא  
תְּהִפְתָּחָה כְּנֻדְרָתָה שָׂמָא תָּוֹנָה בְּנָרָה שָׂמָא לֹא תִּנְשָׁא נִשְׁאָתָה שָׂמָא  
לֹא יִהְיוּ לְהָבִין הַזְּקִינָה שָׂמָא הַעֲשָׂה כְּשָׂבִים

“A daughter is for her father a vain treasure. Care for her does not suffer him to sleep in the night: when she is little, lest she be seduced—in her girlhood, lest she should commit fornication—in her maturity, lest she should not be married—when she is married, lest she should not have sons—when she is old, lest she should practise witchcraft.”

The Greek is somewhat different, and is fairly represented by the Authorized Version: “The father worketh for his daughter when no man knoweth, and the care for her taketh away sleep: when she is young, lest she pass away the flower of her age (is it possible that the true reading here is *παρακρονήσῃ*?)—and being married, lest she should be hated—in her virginity, lest she should be defiled and gotten with child in her father’s house—having a husband, lest she should misbehave herself—and when she is married, lest she should be barren.” The Latin version, while generally in closer agreement with the Greek than the Hebrew, confirms the second clause of the daughter’s history in the Hebrew. The Syriac is somewhat wide of both, though also nearer the Greek than the Hebrew. Still, we venture to maintain the Hebrew to be the original, because each of the five steps in the daughter’s history has a meaning. Buxtorf informs us that till the end of her twelfth year a girl was *קָטָנָה*, for six months she was *נָשָׂרָה*, after that she was *בָּנָרָה*. These three stages are evidently in the mind of the authors; and then there is the position of being married; and lastly, old age.

If we now take this passage up clause by clause, we find ourselves again far removed from Biblical Hebrew. In the first clause, *מִתְמֻמָּה* is unknown to Biblical Hebrew. The corresponding masculine noun does occur, but the feminine termination is not added to it—not even where, as in Prov. ii. 4, a feminine noun is the subject. The Latin translating *abscondita* shows the translator had this word before him, but regarded it as the *participle plural* from the verb *מִתְמַמֵּן*, “to hide.” If the next clause presents no peculiarities, that which follows has a peculiarity in every word which would render it impossible to have been written even by “writers of the age of the authors of Chronicles and Esther.” The first word is the abstract noun *קַמְבָּתָה*; while the adjective and the verb from which it is derived are relatively frequent, the noun never occurs in the Hebrew Scriptures. The next word, *אָמַת* (or, as Dukes points it, *אָמַתְּ*), *lest*, is more important, as it is a connective—*אָמַת* is the ordinary Biblical equivalent. Canon Driver renders (in Dan. i. 10) *lest*, a rendering which certainly prepares for *אָמַתְּ*: but yet the form in Daniel is obviously a much earlier one than that in Ben Sira. Connectives of this sort are pretty conclusive marks of the age of a book. Thus, to take an example,

*peradventure* occurs about thirty times in our English Bible, and *perhaps* only thrice. One might search a modern book from title-page to *finis* and not find a single case of "peradventure." If, however, one is quoting from an old work a phrase where that word occurred, it would not be forgotten, whatever was: so, if one were imitating the writing of the Tudor or early Stuart age, "peradventure" would certainly be introduced. From this we argue that נִזְבֵּן stood in the original document. Again, the last word in this clause, נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ, is not used in this conjugation in the Bible; moreover, the passive use of the Hithpael is so rare that it may be doubted whether it really occurs at all;<sup>1</sup> Nordheimer does not acknowledge the existence of a passive sense to the Hithpael. The next clause begins with the abstract noun נִשְׁרָה, which is unknown to Biblical Hebrew. So with the next clause, the first נִזְבֵּר, *having reached the marriageable age*, not uncommon in Rabbinic writings, is unknown in the Hebrew of Scripture. In the same clause we have the use of נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ in the Niphal *to be married (nubere)*, a usage unknown to Biblical Hebrew, in which נִשְׁבַּרְתָּ, Kal of the man and Niphal of the woman. The nearest approach to this usage is 2 Chron. xxiv. 3 and Neh. xiii. 25, where the action of a father *taking a wife* for his son is represented, and 2 Chron. xiii. 21, where the husband is represented as *taking a wife*: the passive use nowhere occurs. In the last clause, the phrase נִשְׁלַחֲנָה בְּלִבְנֵים, *to practise witchcraft*, is not Biblical; the Biblical use is נִשְׁלַחֲנָה in the Piel. Of these seven clauses there is only one that does not betray, by its words or construction, how late it is: four of the words are Rabbinic, and one of these is a connective; two of the verbs, though Biblical, are not used in the sense or conjugation in which they appear in the verses before us. The last phrase is not Biblical.

There is another long passage quoted by Rabbi Joseph, several of the verses of which are verifiable as being found in the Greek Ecclesiasticus. We shall not, however, take them up; we shall only refer to the use of אֲשֶׁר. This word is always in the *construct* state, and all through the Bible in Daniel, as well as in other books, it is the opening word of an exclamatory clause; in a verse which forms No. 7 in Dukes' collection it forms the predicate of a sentence.

For the alleged differences between the Hebrew of Daniel and that of the rest of Scripture, we shall avail ourselves of the list supplied by Mr. Bevan, the most recent English commentator on Daniel, one whose ability, scholarship, and fairness we cannot doubt, however much we may differ from the conclusions to which he has arrived. The examples he adduces are eight. The first thing that strikes the reader is the smallness of the number. What are these eight words, collected out of the seven Hebrew chapters of Daniel, compared with the crop of differences we have got in these four verses, without going further? These become fewer when we

<sup>1</sup> נִזְבֵּר in Judges xx., xxi. is really reflexive. Fürst regards the case in Eccl. viii. 10 as reflexive from a different verb from that from which the word in question is ordinarily derived. Moreover there is a difference of reading.

catechize them closely. The three first examples are from the first chapter, the work in all probability of the compiler. The first word is **לִי**, *age, generation*. Evidently the Chigi translator had a different reading before him; he renders *συντρεφομένος* as if he had **לִי**. If the *daleth* were indistinct, it might be that the Masoretic scribe thought that *yod* had been the letter, and then the other alteration would be necessitated by grammar. When two readings are before us, that which is linguistically the older is, other things being equal, to be preferred, because the recent would be preferred by a copist as more likely to be understood. Moreover, **לִי** has, according to Buxtorf, a restricted meaning, “born under the same planet.” Fürst, however, instancing **לִי**, would hold the word to be really old. The next word is **בָּנָה**, from **בָּנָה**, *Piel, to endanger*. According to Fürst, the participle *Kal* of this same verb occurs in Ezekiel xviii. 7. It occurs in Daniel in the speech of the chief of the eunuchs, *i.e.*, of one to whom Aramaic was the language of business; therefore if **בָּנָה** had at all got a footing in Hebrew, it would be apt to be used if the word had been used in the original speech. This may also explain **לִי**. The next instance Mr. Bevan adduces is **בָּעֵם**, *pulse*; this occurs in the 16th verse of the first chapter; in the 12th verse we have for precisely the same article the presumably older form, **בָּעֵם**. The natural explanation is that some scribe inserted the **ב** by a blunder, all the more readily that the word thus spelt is in Rabbinic use, whereas the former is a *άπαξ λεγόμενον*. It is difficult to imagine what has led Mr. Bevan to insert **לִי** among words that have no root elsewhere in Scripture. **לִי** is fairly frequent, and the reduplicated form of the *Hithpael* is not rare in regard to these verbs. More might be said for **בָּנָה**, *decreed*, ix. 24, were there not a doubt as to whether it really belongs to the text. It means, correctly speaking, not *decreed* or *determined*, but *divided*, hence Theodotion renders it *συνεπιμήθησαν, cut short*. In the LXX. it is rendered *ἐκριθήσαν*, a rendering which suggests that **לִי**, *determined*, was in the document before the translator. We will admit without cavil that **בָּנָה** is an Aramaic root, and means to *engrave*, but that one Aramaic word should be used by a man speaking Aramaic daily, when he wrote Hebrew, is not surprising. The next two examples being in chapter xi., the authenticity of which we doubt, we might neglect them; but as to the former of these, **בָּנָה**, *treasures*, xi. 42, one might be tempted to suggest that the true reading was **בָּנָה**: it seems extremely doubtful whether the word can mean *treasures*. **לִי** really means to *lie in wait*. However, from the fact that the LXX. have *τόπος*, it is not impossible that the word used was **בָּנָה**. The latter example, **בָּנָה**, *palace-tent*, xi. 45, is probably Aramaic for the *palace-tent* of a monarch, a technical name for a thing by supposition used by a monarch of Babylon and Syria. Mr. Bevan subjoins **מָדִינָה**, *kingdoms*, viii. 22, as a form unknown till Rabbinic times. The Chigi translator evidently read **בָּנָה**, as he translates the word *βασιλεῖς*, as does also Theodotion. He refers also to the non-classical construction, **אָנָה כְּרוֹשָׁת**, instead of **כְּרוֹשָׁת אָנָה**, viii. 13; the latter part of this

chapter seems somehow corrupt, so that little can be built, yet one construction is not much to lay stress on.

Of the words common to Daniel and Chronicles we would only refer to יְהִי, *how?* which differs from the common Biblical יְהִי simply by the interchange of ה and י, which Mr. Bevan regards as a mere matter of orthography when he comes to consider the question of the Aramaic of Daniel. Mr. Bevan mentions in a note that in the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan we have the form יְהִי ; he does not mention that in the Targum of Onkelos, Palestinian in origin as is the Targum of the pseudo-Jonathan, and nearer the date of Daniel by probably a couple of centuries, we have יְהִי. Does Mr. Bevan mean to maintain that Daniel was written A.D. 300? His reference to the Palestinian Christian Lectionary would seem to favour this view.

As Canon Driver has well stated, "the great turning point in Hebrew style" between Old Hebrew and Middle Hebrew "falls in the age of Nehemiah." The Jews when they returned to their own land found the villages of their native country peopled with settlers to whom Aramaic was the common tongue. Hebrew had already, even in the days of Jeremiah, been affected by Aramaic, and this process had gone on during their stay in Babylon ; now the process was carried further. All this was the effect of the Persian domination, and the necessity of living in amity with those that, like themselves, were subjects of the great king. If this was the turning point between Old and Middle Hebrew, when was the turning point between Middle and New Hebrew? We know that great as were the changes wrought in civil and social habits of the Jews by the Persian, yet greater were wrought by the Greek. We know that Aramaic was rapidly replaced by Greek as the language of business. We know further that the Roman domination was socially little more than a continuation of that of Greece. The probability, then, is that the turning point between Middle Hebrew and New is to be placed in the reign of the Lagid princes ; a view of matters that is confirmed by our study of the fragments of Ben Sira. There is a wide distinction between the Hebrew of these quotations and that of Daniel, Nehemiah, and Esther, and a great resemblance to the Hebrew of the Mishna.

NOTE.—We cannot close without referring to a statement Mr. Bevan makes, p. 27, "That the Book of Jubilees was written in Hebrew is certain." We should like to know the grounds of his certainty ; for our part we think the name given to Satan, *Mastema*, points rather to Aramaic being the original tongue.

## EXPOSITORY THOUGHT.

*JONAH.*

BY REV. H. J. FOSTER.

WHAT is it which strikes us most when we read, or when we recall, the Book of Jonah? Where should we lay the stress and emphasis of interest and importance? Surely not upon the incident of the "whale," so-called; that would be to read the book with very childish eyes. Is it, then, upon the character of the prophet himself? That would be better, and worthier of men and women. Human Nature, always the same, and yet never in any two cases alike, but full of infinite variety, is always worth studying, and Jonah is a very interesting sample of Human Nature. But even then we should miss the one special thing of the book, that which is its very burden and the distinctive contribution which it makes to the sum of Old Testament truth. Let us realize the man and his times. Jonah was a man of the Northern Kingdom—an Israelite prophet, who had been foretelling the highest prosperity to which the Ten Tribes ever attained, and the widest extension which, under Jeroboam II., their territory ever received. Nineveh was a Gentile, that is to say, a heathen, city; the very city, moreover, from which were to come those judgments and the destruction which prophets like Jonah's contemporary, Amos, were about this time beginning to announce as certain to fall upon Israel at no very distant date. Jonah the Israelite, then, was sent to a heathen city, and—whether he knew it or not—to that particular enemy of his country from which there was most to fear. To an Israelite patriot, with even the smallest intimation of this, how natural to say, "To Nineveh? No, let Nineveh go on and sin, and perish: the sooner the safer for my country. To warn Nineveh, and so to turn away its doom—what is that but to keep alive the fire which is to consume our Samaria and our national life?" In any case, whether Jonah felt any patriotic difficulty or not, the religious difficulty was great enough. To go to heathen people with God's message, one of mercy, as he saw clearly, quite as much as of judgment—that alone was repugnant to all his instincts. "No. Rather let me no longer be one of the prophets who stand in the Presence of Jehovah, ready for any errand, awaiting His commands. Rather let me lay down my office and go out from before His Face. Let me die first!" That is the heart of a good man, but of a narrow one. It is not the heart of the God even of the Old Testament.

It is sometimes made matter of reproach to the New Testament, and to Christianity as it is there expounded, that it makes little or no account of Patriotism. There is some truth in the criticism; but why? Patriotism has often been a noble thing; but it is really a narrow thing, narrower, at any rate, than the heart and view of God. The patriot sees and loves his fellow-countrymen; God only sees Man. He loves Israel, even the idolatrous

Israel of the Ten Tribes. They were, after all, of the seed of Abraham, His friend (2 Kings xiii. 23, xiv. 27). But God loved the World. God so loved the World that He would have one of the earliest, if not the earliest, of the prophetic writers to go and offer His mercy to a heathen city, the enemy of His people. It is the fashion to call Luke's Gospel, in contrast with those of Matthew and Mark, the Gospel of the Gentiles, in part because the Samaritans, half-heathen as they were reckoned, find in it such honourable mention. With much more reason might we call Jonah the Prophet of the Gentiles. Other prophets prophesied about them. Some prophesied against them. Jonah, and Jonah only, went and prophesied to them. We may not call the Old Testament narrow when what is perhaps the pioneer book of all its written prophecy is the story of a Mission from Israel to the Heathen.

If we could have asked Jonah himself what was the most wonderful feature of this marvellous episode in his life, and if we could have lent him New Testament words for his reply, they must have been those of the wondering Church of Jerusalem, when they had heard from Peter how, like Jonah, against all his prejudices and training, and sorely against his will, he had gone to the Gentile Cornelius and had baptized him. Jonah would have said, "Then hath God granted **UNTO THE GENTILES ALSO** repentance unto life" (Acts xi. 18).

And that is *the* thought of God in this Book of Jonah. In the very forefront of the writings of the prophets of the Old Testament He has placed this witness, that even the heathen are "men of His goodwill." That is, beyond everything else, the important and interesting thing about the Book of Jonah.

Indeed, the whole book is full of anticipations of the New Testament. What was Jonah, as he sat "very angry" under the dwindling shadow of his withering gourd, but an Elder Brother, grudging and grumbling at God's mercy toward a Prodigal City, repentant now and returning? He had himself not been unlike a Prodigal Son, fleeing from his Father into a far country. As we have just seen, some of the essential lines of this history are also those of the story of Peter and Cornelius, anticipated by the better part of a millennium. God's heart and purpose toward the world had always been wider than His own Israel and its religion. For centuries, for His people's sake, He was obliged to wall them in, as it were, with ordinances of rigid separateness. Yet, all along, the rain and sunshine of His goodness had been poured down upon the wilderness outside the wall of His Vineyard (Isa. v. 1, 2). He had to build "a middle wall of partition" across the world's great temple-floor, and for centuries Israel alone was admitted to the favoured area within. But Jonah was sent out—was indeed thrust out—bearing a real Gospel, into the outer court, the great Court of the Gentiles, betokening another stage reached in the unfolding of the purposes of that God Who has now done away with the wall altogether. To-day every redeemed soul is free to the whole floor of God's great temple. "We have a way *into the Holiest* by the blood of Jesus." But that, of course, was far

away out of Jonah's sight. The book closes with startling abruptness: "Much cattle." Doth, then, God take care for, not only the citizens and the children, but even the cattle of a heathen city? These words are coming, and are being antedated—"Your Heavenly Father feedeth the sparrows."

It is very natural to inquire, "Why call Jonah a prophet? There is hardly any prophesying in the book. The only prediction which it contains is a very short one, and had only a very short course to run. In fact, it was not fulfilled at all. Nineveh was not overthrown at the end of forty days." The answer to the very natural remark may lead to a true conception of what Prophecy really was. This earliest book of the prophetic Scriptures—according to the customary classification of the books—is very remarkable as an example of it.

With childish eyes again, we are apt to let our gaze be fascinated by what was the smaller thing in Prophecy, the occasional predictions which the prophets uttered. Prediction was only an accident of prophecy; it might be there, or it might not, as it happened. Two things can readily be ascertained by any reader of an ordinary English Bible. First, that while some prophetic books contain many predictions, many more predict but seldom. And then that the "prophecy" which, for example, in the Epistles to Corinth we see in lingering survival in the Christian Church, when even Pentecost was past and the Comforter was come, is hardly prediction at all. More often and more helpfully it would be described as specially-inspired Preaching, though even in the New Testament a prophet like Agabus might predict the near future (Acts xi., xxi.).<sup>1</sup> What Christians (say) in Corinth needed was not so much an unveiling of the Future as an authoritative exposition of the mind and will of God for their every-day guidance in the Present. They needed Preachers rather than Seers of the Future. And the "prophets" of Corinth and Thessalonica were pre-eminently preachers of the will of Christ. So, in fact, all the prophets were first of all, and most of all, preachers declaring "present truth" to the men of their own time. It might happen, and in point of fact generally did happen, that this present truth was also eternal truth. Their message was then one for every age, and in that case was put upon permanent record. Then, further, their teaching was illustrated by Facts. These might be the facts of their own day, in which case the prophets became chroniclers and historians, recording and commenting upon what was even then becoming the Past. But they wrote history for *preaching purposes*, so to speak; they delivered a message from God through the vehicle of history. Sometimes it would happen that their message could not be completely illustrated, or even completely delivered, without bringing in the facts of the Future, and then they uttered predictions.

<sup>1</sup> New Testament "prophecy" included predictions, whether such short and, so to say, trivial ones as those spoken by Paul (Acts xxvii.), or such grand and important ones as that of the Man of Sin (2 Thess ii.). But even such predictions as make up the bulk of the Revelation are not given for the sake of the predictions. They are for teaching and comfort, and satisfy 2 Tim. iii. 16.

But they were preachers through the vehicle of prediction. When fulfilled, their predictions become, to the generations which witness their fulfilment, credentials of the men and of the Book which contained their utterances. But in the true view of Prophecy the crowning utility of predicted facts was for teaching. It was teaching by Divinely-anticipated History. There may have been, and probably were, in the "schools of the prophets" many who did their work and delivered their message of God's truth without predicting at all. There are not a few examples, especially in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, of such men, on whom once, and once only, in their life there came the spirit of prediction—prophets for the occasion, and for that only. At all events, so far as we know, two short predictions are all that fell from Jonah's lips, this of chap. iii. 4, and that other as to the wide extension of the kingdom of Jeroboam II. (2 Kings xiv. 25). But Jonah was very really and very gloriously a prophet when he was pouring out his soul's experiences in the grand psalm which forms chap. ii. of his book; and the English version of iii. 2 exactly and accurately expresses the truth about a prophet's work: "Go and preach unto Nineveh the preaching that I bid thee."

This, too, will make it clear how his message of threatening could be so positive and yet after all could be left unfulfilled. Indeed, to announce the impending doom was the very way to open a door for the hope that the city would not be destroyed. In heathen thought, the doom of a guilty man, or city, or family, or country, was a Fate, inevitable and inexorable, closing with a relentless convergence upon the guilty. It might come with or without warning; it always came without hope. John the Baptist put the truth about God's denunciations of doom against sin into one brief, vivid, figure: "The axe is laid unto the root of the trees" (Matt. iii. 10). If God had desired and finally determined to cut Nineveh down, He would have brought and used the axe there and then. But He let it lie in their sight for forty days—for use, if it must be; but, best of all, that the evil tree, Nineveh, might repent and bring forth fruit. "The goodness of God led" Nineveh, as it was intended to do, "to repentance" (Rom. ii. 4).

One wonderful thing in this book has sometimes been declared to be past belief, that the whole city should be so moved by the bare word of a stranger in its streets. They who know Oriental people best find least difficulty in accepting the fact, as Christ did. Sir Henry Layard has known a whole Mussulman town thrown into a panic, because a priest, and he a Christian, perambulated its streets threatening a plague, as a visitation from God for the people's sin. That is a small difficulty. But a much larger one, and a very real one, is connected with the "whale." "To begin with," it is said, "a whale's small throat could not pass a whole man." In reply it may be said that on all hands it is agreed that the Bible itself, whether Hebrew or Greek, does not certainly say anything about a "whale." Plainly the very English itself of the Book of Jonah does not. It is the English translators of the Gospel of Matthew who have made what difficulty there is for English readers. Both the Hebrew and the Greek words are very vague

and general. The Hebrews were no sailors, and knew little about the sea and its inhabitants. Their word meant nothing more definite than a great sea-monster. The Greek word would include a whale, but is one of very wide significance. Those who speak and write with authority on such points concur that the Bible is only pledged to some big creature of the ocean.

Then, further, it is abundantly clear from the sailors and the naturalists that there are in the Mediterranean huge sea-monsters in plenty which could swallow Jonah entire. The big gullet of the requin shark, for example, could do so. It has been killed with men inside whole. Its huge mouth certainly could hold Jonah, unbitten and unhurt. Requin shark or some other, the Mediterranean has great fishes enough to serve God's turn as a living tomb for an untouched prophet. There is no miracle and no difficulty on that point. God always does with as little miracle as possible.

The real miracle was, it need hardly be said, that Jonah should survive so long in his strange prison. "That violates the laws of Nature." But let us once understand Christ's profound saying about a Father Who "worketh hitherto" (John v. 17), that is, Who has never taken His hand off from the Thing which He has created, but is ceaselessly active and operative in His creation. Once let us understand that all Force, in the last reach of our thought, is Will Force, and that the forces of Nature are only the many-sided puttings forth of that Force of the Will of God, outspoken and expressed in that Word of His power by which He upholdeth all things. Once understand that there are no "Laws of Nature" to be violated, except the Rules which He has laid down for His own ordinary and orderly action in governing His world. Once let it be seen that, whilst for our sakes it is generally best and happiest that He should keep to His own rules, and should very seldom indeed do in any way differently, yet He is at perfect liberty to choose whether He will keep to His ordinary and orderly plan, or for some special reason will in any particular instance turn aside. Then, if there is as good evidence for the Fact as the case admits of; and, above all, if plainly there is good reason for the Fact; we may as reasonably find no more difficulty in the Miracle than in the General Providence. What is ordinary is of God, just as much as the extraordinary. The natural is of God, as much as the supernatural. Once more it may be said that, if our eyes were not too much the eyes of the children, we should see that the Wonder is the orderly, reliable, age-long, ordinary Providence, rather than the Special Thing, done just once, to meet an emergency for which the ordinary rule and method did not sufficiently provide. And the special is not an after-thought. It is provided for in the whole great plan of the Worker. It is one of His Rules.

It quite as much needed God to keep Jonah alive year after year in the atmosphere and upon the earth, as to keep him alive for three days within the body of the great fish.

Was there, then, the emergency here? For the sake of Nineveh,

perhaps, the miracle might have been dispensed with. We cannot tell whether he related to the people his own story or not, and whether or not, therefore, the story of the messenger added impressiveness to his words. It may be that the mere presence of this strange man in their city, with his cry of warning, may have been the "sign unto the Ninevites," just as the presence of so wonderful a Teacher amongst them was a real sign to the men of Christ's own generation, even before they knew anything of His coming resurrection.

But, that apart, and determined as we may think most probable, let it be considered what God was doing. All through the centuries He was building up a History, and building up a Bible. He was leading up to the Revelation of His Son by a history which itself was a revelation as well as a history, and was securing what may be called a Divinely "official" and authentic account of it. Also, just as through the long geological ages He had made Nature full of forms and facts which anticipated and suggested Man, so He had made this history full all along of suggestions and anticipations of the Son of Man. At this point of the history we are at a new departure. In the narrower, customary sense, the written prophecy of the Bible is beginning. It was not unfitting that one of the first men, perhaps the very first, to contribute to it, should be a special man, with a special and suggestive history. As was above shown, he made a new departure in his very work, in that he went with God's message to a heathen land, far beyond the usual area of Revelation.

And the programme of his life is this. He is a prophet from Galilee, and by the hands of heathen men (Acts ii. 23) was delivered to death, to save their own lives. For three days he has been, as it were, buried; but God has not "left his soul in Hades, neither has suffered his flesh to see corruption." He has come forth from his strange entombment to a new life, to become God's Ambassador to the enemies of the people of God. He is, in fact, "a light to lighten the Gentiles," as well as "to be the glory of God's people, Israel."

"Of whom are you speaking? Of Jonah, or of Jesus?" Jonah is very unlike Jesus—just as Samson, or Moses, or Joseph, or David are very unlike Jesus. And yet there is not one of them in whose story, or whose character, or in whose mission and work, there does not gleam out one, at least, of those fitful resemblances to Christ which always strike a New Testament reader of the Old. Like those touches of likeness which bind together the children of one family, or father and child, these gleams of resemblance are often slight, often hard to catch; they are caught, perhaps, by a momentary glance, and lost when one looks closely for them. But they are there. They are here in Jonah and his story, and perhaps the best answer we can give to the question proposed just now may be, that the need of such a man, to do such a work, at such a juncture in the preparation for the Son of Man, was, more than even the need of Nineveh, the emergency which "justified" the miracle.

ST. JUDE'S QUOTATIONS FROM ZECHARIAH.

By REV. C. H. H. WRIGHT, D.D., PH.D.,

*Grinfield Lecturer on the Septuagint in the University of Oxford.*

THE application of criticism to the Sacred Scriptures is in most cases a protest against the authority of tradition. Points which have been for ages supposed to have been decisively settled by the authority of ecclesiastical tradition are in our age subjected anew to minute investigation. Such investigations are by no means to be discouraged. The cause of truth has nothing to fear from honest inquiry. But the conclusions of the critics require often to be submitted to the same ordeal of re-examination. For if there be a disposition to undue dogmatism on the side of the traditionalists, there is almost an equal tendency to dogmatism of a different kind on the part of the critics.

Critical conjecture in Biblical matters cannot be dispensed with, for in many cases it has borne good fruit. The disposition, however, to adopt conjectural emendation of the traditional texts of the Sacred Books requires to be narrowly watched. All hypotheses which aim at any reconstruction of Biblical histories and prophecies should be viewed with healthy suspicion: for the bolder the critic, and the more radical his hypothesis, the greater chance there is of its adoption. New solutions of old difficulties are more or less attractive, and "outsiders" are often disposed, without any thorough investigation, to accept such solutions on the authority of some distinguished critic.

If, therefore, questions long ago closed by the authority of tradition be again and again re-opened by critics, it is fitting that critical judgments, even when generally acquiesced in, should from time to time be tested in order to see whether they rest upon a solid basis.

Origen, who was a pupil of Clement of Alexandria, and imbibed not a little of his spirit, maintained (and his opinion was acquiesced in by other patristic authorities) that the incident noticed by St. Jude, of the contention between Michael the archangel and Satan concerning the body of Moses, was derived from an apocryphal work designated *The Assumption of Moses*.

The correctness of that conclusion has been repeatedly called in question. I propose on the present occasion to re-state the arguments adduced against Origen's view in my Bampton Lectures on Zechariah, with some additional arguments in support of the opinion that St. Jude refers to the vision of Zech. iii., and to that only.

Before, however, entering on the question as to what is the real meaning of Jude ver. 9, it may be well to call attention to the fact that in verse 23 of that Epistle there are two other references to the vision of Zech. iii.

The latter verse (Jude 23) is thus translated in the Revised Version: "and some save, snatching them out of the fire (*ἐκ πυρὸς ἀρπάζοντες*); and on some have mercy with fear; hating even the garment spotted (*ἐσπιλωμένον*)

χιτῶνα) by the flesh." These words (of which the Greek is given), which are alike in both the Authorised Version and the Revised, are recognized in Westcott & Hort's Greek Testament as quotations from Zech. iii. 2 ff., and are accordingly there printed in uncial characters.

The rendering of the LXX. translation of Zech. iii. 2, 3 is not, however, verbally identical with the text of the New Testament writer. The LXX. translate Zech. iii. 2, οὐκ ἰδοὺ τοῦτο ὡς δαλὸς ἔξεσπασμένος ἐκ πυρός. In verse 3, the ἵματα τὰ ῥιπαρά, though a good rendering of the original Hebrew, is not verbally identical with the expression of St. Jude, although an excellent commentary on it.

The first of the two allusions to Zech. iii. contained in the 23rd verse of St. Jude might (if it stood alone) indeed be regarded as a quotation from Amos iv. 11. For the same expression, "a brand plucked from the fire," occurs in the two passages, and though there is a slight difference between the two passages in the Hebrew original, in the LXX. translation the phrases are identical. If, however, the idea of "the garment spotted by the flesh" be indeed derived from Zech. iii. 3, it is clear that it was Zech. iii. 2 which was in the mind of the New Testament writer when he alludes to "pulling" or "snatching" persons "out of the fire."

It is not necessary to go deeply into the exegesis of verses 22 and 23 of St. Jude's Epistle. The reading of those verses adopted by the Revisers differs considerably from that of the Textus receptus translated by the Authorised Version. According to the Revised Version, the New Testament writer seems to have had in view three different classes of libertines, although the special characteristics belonging to each class are not described. The text which the Authorised Version follows speaks only of two classes. The difference is immaterial so far as our present purpose is concerned. Some are to be saved by the employment of holy earnestness and violence. They must, as it were, be snatched out of the fire. According to the reading of the Revised Version, special care must be exercised by those who seek to convert others from the sins of the flesh, lest they themselves be entangled in similar transgression. Those engaged in all "rescue-work" must hate "the garment spotted by the flesh."

The New Testament writer employs the language of the Old Testament in a wider signification than the language bore in the vision of Zechariah. Some commentators of eminence, in commenting on the phrase employed by St. Jude in ver. 23, assume, however, that the difference in meaning is wider than it really is. For it is often asserted that the word χιτῶν employed by St. Jude in this passage necessarily means the under-garment worn next to the body—the "shirt," "which would itself be rendered unclean if the body were unclean" (Plummer).

But, whatever may be said as to the precise signification of the Greek χιτῶν, that word is used in the LXX. translation of the Old Testament, not only to denote the inner, but also the outer garment. The long garment with sleeves to the wrists worn by Tamar (2 Sam. xiii. 18) is correctly rendered

by the LXX. *χιτών καρπωτός*; and "the holy linen coat" worn by Aaron on the Day of Atonement (Lev. xvi. 4), instead of the more gorgeous outer-garment worn on other occasions, is rendered by the LXX. *χιτώνα λινοῦν ιγυασμένον*.

Zechariah in his vision beheld Joshua, who was high priest at the Restoration, "clad in filthy garments." Ewald conjectured that those filthy garments were robes of mourning worn by the high priest, then accused of some charges preferred against him at the Persian Court, and that the object of the vision was to inform him that he would shortly be declared innocent. Dean Stanley further improved upon that suggestion, and explained the "filthy garments" as meaning the soiled and worn clothing of the suffering exile, which the Dean imagined the vision showed would soon be "replaced by the old magnificence of Aaron and Zadok."

But both interpretations alike are untenable. "The filthy garments," *בְּנֵרִים צוֹאִים*, mentioned in Zech. iii. 3, 4 were, properly speaking, garments stained with excrement (for which *צָאָה* and *צָאָה*, from the verb *אָצַע*, to go out, is the proper word). The adjective occurs only in this passage, but the noun is tolerably common. The word is used of sin by Isaiah (iv. 4), who speaks of "the filth of the daughters of Zion." So in Prov. xxx. 12 we read of a generation of those "clean (*טוֹרָה*) or pure in their own eyes," and yet "are not washed from their filthiness (*מְצַאָתָה*)."<sup>1</sup> The "filthiness of the flesh" is further spoken of in connection with sin in the striking passage in Isaiah lxiv. 5, "We are all become as one that is unclean (*עַמְּלָאָה*), and all our righteousnesses are as a polluted garment (*בְּכָנְרַתִּים*, lit., 'as a menstrual garment')."<sup>2</sup> It is utterly impossible, therefore, to suppose that Zechariah spoke of the garments of mourning, or of old and worn-out garments: what he depicted was emphatically "a garment spotted with the flesh," as Jude paraphrases it. Such a garment was in the vision worn by the high priest at the very time when he ought to have been clothed in garments of purity. The phrase "a clean mitre" (*צָנִינָה טָהָרָה*), used twice in Zech. iii. 5, is highly significant. The high priest, who was standing before the Angel of Jahveh (which Angel is in the very passage identified with Jehovah Himself) was standing in a ministerial capacity, ministering before Him (comp. Gen. xli. 46; Deut. i. 38; 1 Kings i. 2; 1 Kings x. 8), that is he appeared in the vision officiating on the Day of Atonement in the holy of holies. On that occasion the high priest was required to wear a pure white linen mitre and robe. But alas! under such solemn circumstances, Joshua appears clad in both a robe and mitre "spotted by the flesh."

How terrible such a sight must have been, and how full of awful significance, in the eyes of the priest-prophet Zechariah! Satan, too, was there pointing out the depth to which the high priest had fallen. But one glance at the scene sufficed to show the prophet that mercy was even there prevailing over judgment. The high priest's guilt could not indeed be denied, yet mercy was extended to him, and to Jerusalem (the Jewish Church), of which he was the representative. The filthy garments spotted by the flesh were

taken away, and the high priest robed in clean garments and a clean mitre. The scene might well be depicted in the language of the Book of Revelation. It was granted to Joshua, the high priest, that he should be arrayed in "fine linen clean and white, for the fine linen is the righteousness of saints" (Rev. xix. 8).

This was the Old Testament vision vividly before the mind of St. Jude, as he thought over the sinners whose conduct disgraced the Church of Christ in his own day, and pondered on the fact that there were peculiar dangers which, owing to the infirmity of the flesh, were attendant on all efforts to extricate such sinners from the fire of Divine wrath. For those engaged in such work must "hate even the garment spotted by the flesh."

Despite, therefore, the slight variations in language, the double reference in Jude ver. 23 to the vision of Zechariah is one which is self-evident. But if this be so, as the best commentators and critics have admitted, the fact forms a powerful argument in support of the opinion that it is to that vision also, and not to the apocryphal book known as the *Assumption of Moses*, that St. Jude refers in the disputed passage found in ver. 9. The sentence there quoted, "the Lord rebuke thee," is found in Zech. iii. 2. On the other hand, that particular expression does not occur in the *Assumption of Moses*, so far as scholars are in possession of its text; and the patristic evidence in favour of the assertion that even the story of a contest between Michael and Satan formed part of that book is by no means so strong as it has often been represented to be.

In discussing this point, it is necessary to survey the testimonies of the Fathers. In Rufinus' Latin translation of Origen's work, *De Principiis* (the Greek original of which is lost), book iii., in the very commencement of chap. ii. Origen says, "We have now to notice, agreeably to the statements of Scripture, how the opposing powers, or the devil himself, contends with the human race, inciting and instigating men to sin. And in the first place in the Book of Genesis the serpent is described as having seduced Eve, regarding whom, in the work entitled *The Ascension of Moses* (a little treatise, of which the Apostle Jude makes mention in his Epistle), the archangel Michael, when disputing with the devil regarding the body of Moses, says that the serpent, being inspired by the devil, was the cause of Adam and Eve's transgression."<sup>1</sup>

The book referred to here as the *Ascension of Moses* (*Adscensio Mosis*) is the same which is variously styled the *'Ανάβασις τοῦ Μώυσεως*, or *'Ανάληψις Μώυσεως*, or the *Assumptio Moyseos*. Although Origen affirms that Jude in referring to the dispute about the body of Moses between Satan and the archangel Michael alludes to that apocryphal book, he does not affirm that the sentence "the Lord rebuke thee" is quoted from thence.

Origen's *De Principiis* was probably written somewhere about A.D. 240.

<sup>1</sup> The words of Origen bearing on our subject are: "De quo in *Adscensione Mosis*, cuius libelli meminit in epistola sua apostolus Iulias, Michael archangelus cum diabolo disputans de corpore Mosis, ait diabolo inspiratum serpentem causam extitisse prævaricationis Adæ et Eva."

Clement of Alexandria, who died about A.D. 220, was Origen's teacher, and his predecessor in the Alexandrian school. In his *Stromata*, or *Miscellanies*, book vi. chap. 15, that Father refers thus to the *Assumption*, in speaking of the double comprehension of the Scriptures according to the letter and according to the spirit:—"Rightly, therefore (*εἰκότως ἄρα, naturally then*), Jesus the son of Nave [Joshua the son of Nun, who is spoken of in the *Assumption*] saw Moses when taken up [to heaven] double,—one Moses with the angels, and one on the mountains honoured with burial in the ravines [*τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τὰ ὅρη περὶ τὰς φάραγγας κηδείας ἀξιούμενον*]."

This reference of Clement of Alexandria to the *Assumption* is similar to that in Origen in *libr. Iesu Nave hom.* 2, 1. The same point is also mentioned by Evodius, Bishop of Uzala, the friend of Augustine. But, however interesting, it has no bearing whatever upon the incident referred to in Jude 9.

The only express reference to Jude 9 in the works of Clement of Alexandria is contained in a note on the passage in his *Hypotypes*, which is extant only in a Latin version, and may have been interpolated. His entire note on that passage is: "‘Quando Michaël archangelus, cum diabolo disputans altercabatur de corpore Moysis’: hic confirmat *Assumptionem Moysis*. Michaël autem hic dicitur qui per propinquum nobis angelum altercabatur cum Diabolo.” But Clement of Alexandria is a writer whose quotations are not always marked with accuracy, and his allusion, therefore, to the *Assumption* may have been derived from hearsay. Moreover, all he says is that the Epistle of Jude confirms the statements of the *Assumption of Moses*, and not that St. Jude has borrowed from that source.

Didymus of Alexandria, in the fourth century (died A.D. 396), maintains also a similar view. His words are: "licet adversarii hujus contemplationis prescribunt presenti epistola et Moyseos Assumptioni propter eum locum ubi significatur verbum Archangeli de corpore Moyseos ad Diabolum factum." These statements are sufficient to prove that in his day Jude's reference to the incident was a reason why certain persons objected to the canonicity of the Epistle as well as to the *Assumption of Moses*. It is, therefore, clear that in certain circles there was a belief that the story was common to both of those writings. More than that cannot be asserted, as the reference is so fragmentary. This concludes all the real evidence on the subject which can be gathered from the Fathers.

Gelasius of Cyzicus, whose history of the Nicene Council was written after A.D. 477, makes the following statement:—"In the book of the *Assumption of Moses*, Michael the archangel disputing says to the devil: 'We were all created by His Holy Spirit,' and again he says: 'From the presence of God went forth His Spirit, and the world was made.'"<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ἐν βιβλῳ Ἀναληψεως Μωσεως Μιχαὴλ ὁ ἀρχάγγελος διαλεγόμενος τῷ διαβόλῳ λέγει· διὸ γὰρ πνεύματος ἀγίου αὐτοῦ πάντες ἐκτισθησαν. καὶ πάλιν λέγει· ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ κόσμος ἐγένετο.—Comm. Act. concil. Nic. 2, 20 (Mansi Concil. ii. p. 857), quoted from Fritzsche, *Lib. Apoc. V. T. Graece.* Pref. p. xxxv.

A statement of Apollinaris (*circa* 362 A.D.), whether of the father or the son is uncertain, is somewhat more precise. He says, "It should be noted that in the times of Moses there were also other books which are now apocryphal, as even the Epistle of Jude shows, when he teaches also about the body of Moses (ver. 9), and mentions as from an old writing: 'Behold the Lord will come,' and so forth (vers. 14, 15)."<sup>1</sup>

Though the *Assumption of Moses* thus appears to have been a book well known to the early Church Fathers, no complete copy of it has as yet been discovered. Nicephorus of Constantinople, in his *Stichometria* appended to the *Chronicon* of Eusebius, mentions that the work consisted of 1,400 verses, or in other words, that it was as large as the Revelation of St. John, to which the same number of verses was attributed (see Hilgenfeld, *Nov. Test. extra Canonem recept.*, Lips. 1866: *Mosis Assumpt.*, p. 98). About one-third of a Latin translation of the work was discovered by Ceriani, chief librarian of the Ambrosian Library at Milan, in an ancient palimpsest, and was published by him in 1861. Internal evidence proves the original work to have been composed prior to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus.

The portion contained in the Milan MS. consists of an exhortation addressed to Joshua by Moses prior to his death. That address contains various predictions of Israel's trials and ultimate recovery. Joshua in his answer refers thus to Moses' sepulchre: "What place will receive thee? or what will be the monument of sepulchre? or who will dare to transfer thy body thence as a man from place to place? for to all who die according to age their sepulchres are in lands; but thy sepulchre is from the rising sun even to the west, and from the south even to the ends of the north: the whole circle of the earth is thy sepulchre."<sup>2</sup> At the end of his speech, Joshua falls a second time at the feet of Moses, who raised him up, placed him on a seat, and began further to exhort him. The fragment here ends abruptly, only ten verses of Moses' reply being preserved.<sup>3</sup>

No part of the portion comprehended in this Latin translation contains the least allusion to any dispute between Michael and Satan, and able critics

<sup>1</sup> σημειωτέων, διτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς χρόνοις Μωϋσέως θάνατοι καὶ ἀλλατι βίβλοι, αἱ τοῦ εἰδοῦς ἀπόκρυφοι, ὡς δηλοῖ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἰουδα ἐπιστολὴ, ὅπου διδάσκεται καὶ περὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως σώματος καὶ ἑνθα μεμνηταὶ ὡς ἐκ παλαιᾶς γραφῆς· ἴδοι κύριος ἦλει, καὶ τὰ εἰδῆ.—Nicephori Catena. Lips. 1772, f. I., p. 1313, quoted by Fritzsche, Praef. p. xxiv.

<sup>2</sup> It should be observed that the Latin is of a very rough and inaccurate kind, and that roughness ought not to be removed in translation for fear of obscuring the original Greek text of which it is the rendering. See Schmidt and Merx' remarks on this point in the article alluded to afterwards.

<sup>3</sup> According to Dr. Plummer (*The General Epistles of St. James and St. Jude*, the "Expositor's Bible Series") the fragment preserved in the Latin translation, "contains the passage quoted by Gelasius." But surely this is a mistake. The nearest approach to the passage given by Gelasius is contained in the second address of Moses to Joshua: "Omnes gentes que sunt in orbe terrarum Deus creavit ut nos," but that cannot be identified with what according to Gelasius Michael says to Satan. Not one word of Michael's speeches is to be found in the fragment discovered by Ceriani.

have doubted whether such a story ever formed part of the book. It may be questioned, therefore, whether the patristic statements may not be explained as originating with some slip of memory on the part of Origen.

For the remarks of Clement of Alexandria in his *Stromata*, and the allusions to the same effect made in the letter of Evodius to Augustine, have no bearing whatever on the Epistle of Jude. The evidence of Clement's comments on Jude (though fragmentary) is of more value. The later statements of Apollinaris and of Didymus of Alexandria appear to be merely verbal echoes of the earlier statement of Origen, who might himself have made the statement on the authority of Clement. They tend to show that the *Assumption of Moses* contained an account of some dispute between Michael and Satan respecting the body of Moses; but not one of them distinctly states that the words quoted by St. Jude, "the Lord rebuke thee," were taken from that book. Gelasius makes no allusion to Jude, though he must be regarded as bearing independent witness in favour of the *Assumption of Moses* having contained an account of a dispute between Michael and the devil. Of the subject of that dispute Gelasius says nothing.

But, on the other hand, attention was called in my *Bampton Lectures* to the fact that Hilgenfeld's remarks (on p. 115 of his edition of the book) show that that critic has doubts as to whether the *Assumption* could ever have contained any such story. Fritzsche has also doubts on the same point (Præf., p. xxxv.). Schmidt and Merx call attention to the fact that the Milan palimpsest contains a note in the margin, written by some person who had the whole book before him, in which it is stated that the book contains the prophecies of Moses in Deuteronomy, or, in other words, that the book was a propheticohistorical expansion of Deut. xxxii. (*Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.*, i. p. 126). The contents of the portion discovered by Ceriani, which, it must be remembered, is a translation from some Greek, or (more probably, as Ewald conjectured) from a Hebrew or Aramaic original, point decidedly in the same direction, and make us suspect some confusion on the part of the patristic authorities already cited. Oecumenius, whose Greek commentaries on various Biblical books are assigned to the middle or close of the tenth century, makes no reference to the *Assumption of Moses*, though in his comments on St. Jude he maintains that the contest between Michael the archangel and the devil about the body of Moses was on this wise: Michael sought to give honourable burial to Moses' remains, but he was opposed by the devil on the ground that Moses did not deserve any such an interment, inasmuch as he had been guilty of the murder of the Egyptian (Exod. ii. 12).

The contest mentioned in the *Midrash Debarim Rabbah* between Sammael, the angel of death, and Michael cannot be the contest to which St. Jude refers. According to that legend, the angel of death claimed the right to take away Moses' life, and Michael was bitterly grieved thereat. In the story, as there related, no word of rebuke was used by Michael. When the angel of death approached Moses with the intention of taking

away his soul, Moses put him to flight by striking him with his rod, which had inscribed on it the Sacred Name. The Most High Himself put an end to the contest by descending on the scene with Michael and two attendant angels. The angels stripped off the garments of Moses, and God with a kiss drew forth his soul from the body, and placed it beneath His throne with the cherubim and seraphim. The body of the lawgiver was then buried by the angels.

There is no trace in any known Jewish legend of the story of any contest between Michael and Satan respecting the body of Moses. It can easily be understood how the words found in Deut. xxxiv. 5, 6 would have given rise to many stories and conjectures. It ought, however, to be borne in mind that it is not by any means even certain that that passage asserts that the Lord buried Moses. This is too often assumed as a fact. The margin of the Revised Version correctly observes that the opening words of ver. 6 can, with equal ease, be translated, "and he was buried," and the LXX. long ago thus understood the passage (*καὶ ἐθύψαν*).

Josephus (*Antiq. Jud.*; *Lib. iv. cap. 8, 49*) asserts that after Moses bade farewell to Eleasar and Joshua, a cloud having suddenly surrounded him, he became invisible or disappeared at a certain ravine (*ἀφανίζεται κατὰ τύνος φάραγγος*). True, however, to the ancient belief of the Jews that even the last verses of Deuteronomy were written by Moses, Josephus immediately adds, "But in the sacred books he wrote that he died, having feared lest through the superabundance of the virtue that was about him they should dare to say that he had gone to the Deity (*πρὸς τὸ θεῖον*)."

The idea that Moses either did not actually die, or after death was raised to life and ascended into heaven, appears to have been the opinion held by many Jewish teachers. Maimonides is said to have held that view. Even some of the Fathers imbibed similar notions. Clement of Alexandria believed in Moses' ascension (*Strom. i. 23*). Gregory of Nyssa speaks of the end of his history as "a living close" (*τελευτὴν ζῶσαν*); and opinions not very dissimilar were expressed by Lactantius, Ambrose, and others. (See the able work of the Roman Catholic scholar Rampf, *Der Brief Judas, hist. krit. exeg. betrachtet*.)

In maintaining that the object which Michael strove to attain was the preservation of Moses' body from corruption, Luthardt upholds a view which has its roots far back in antiquity. At the same time such an opinion has no support in Scripture. Nor is there anything which can really be adduced in favour of the more common view (which is as old as Chrysostom, and was adopted by Calvin), namely, that Satan wished to keep the body of Moses from being buried in order that the Israelites might be drawn into the sin of worshipping it. The latter conjecture is indeed a strange one, for those who put forward that view seem to have been unmindful of the fact that though the bones of Joseph was carried out of Egypt by the Israelites, there is no trace in Scripture of such relics ever having been worshipped. Had the Israelites been naturally inclined to any such veneration of relics,

some indication would have been given in the histories of the Bible. But the Sacred Books never speak of the Israelites offering up religious worship even at the tombs of Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob.

It has been already pointed out that there are serious doubts whether the *Assumption of Moses* ever actually contained an account of any dispute between Michael and Satan. Whether that be true or not, we maintain that the reference in St. Jude's Epistle is not to that Book, but to the vision in the Book of Zechariah.

If it be maintained that the name Michael does not occur in the Book of Zechariah, we may quote the following passage from the *Midrash Shemot*, Par. xviii., "Our holy Rabbi says: It is Michael alone [who is the helper], as it is written (Dan. xii. 1), 'and at that time Michael stands up, the great Prince who stands for the children of thy people,' that is, he works for the necessities of Israel, and speaks for them, as it is written (Zech. i. 12), 'and the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have pity on Jerusalem?' He answered: No one but Michael your Prince supports my people. R. Jose said: To whom are Michael and Samael [the angel of death] like? To the Advocate and Accuser who stand in the judgment. The one speaks as well as the other, but as soon as the latter has finished, when the Advocate perceives that he is certain of victory, then he begins to praise the Judge, and to ask him to pronounce judgment. If the Accuser then desires to add anything to his statement, the Advocate says, Be silent, we desire to hear from the Judge his decision. Thus stand Michael and Samael before the Shekinah, and the Adversary [the Satan] makes his accusation, and Michael defends the merits of Israel, then the Adversary [the Satan] comes to speak, and Michael puts him to silence, &c."

But while it is at least uncertain that the *Assumption of Moses* ever contained any story like that in St. Jude, the Book of Zechariah, as has been seen, does contain the account of a vision seen by that prophet, in which a dispute is related as having taken place between "the Angel of Jahveh" and Satan. That "Angel of Jahveh" is identified, indeed, with Jahveh. But the title Angel continues to be given to him in the verses following. There is no difficulty in identifying the angel who stands forth in the defence of the Lord's people (who were represented by Joshua, the high priest) with him who is mentioned in Dan. xii. 1, as "Michael, the great prince, which standeth for the children of thy people." For, as already proved, the Jews identified Michael and the Angel of the Lord. The very words quoted by St. Jude are those which proceeded from the mouth of the Divine Angel to Zechariah, "And the LORD (Jahveh) said unto Satan (the Adversary), The LORD (Jahveh) rebuke thee, O Satan (O Adversary)."

Let it be borne in mind that Jude actually twice refers in ver. 23 to that self-same vision of Zechariah. Why should we not regard him as quoting from it in ver. 9? The object the Apostle had there specially in view would have been equally well attained by citing the passage of

Zechariah, for that object was simply to rebuke those who lightly spoke evil of dignities.

There exists only one objection to this view, namely, that the subject-matter of dispute mentioned by the New Testament writer is "the body of Moses," while in the Old Testament prophet the subject of dispute was Joshua, the high priest, clothed with the filthy garments.

In the New Testament, however, a contrast is continually drawn between Moses and Christ. The Lord Himself says, "Think not that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, Moses, on whom ye have set your hope" (John v. 45). St. Paul speaks of the Israelites as "all baptized unto (Gr. *into, eis τὸν Μωυσῆν*) Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. x. 2). The same expression as is used in Gal. iii. 27, "As many of you as were baptized into Christ (*eis Christόν*)". Somewhat similar is the comparison made by St. Paul between the Jerusalem that now is and the Jerusalem that is above (Gal. iv. 26, see the whole context), and that found in the Epistle to the Hebrews between "within" and "without the camp" (Heb. xiii. 12-14). These and similar passages (e.g., Rev. ii. 9) render it quite possible that like as the expression "the body of Christ" was constantly used to denote the Church of Christ in the Pauline Epistles, the expression "the body of Moses" was employed by St. Jude to denote the Jewish Church of the days of Zechariah. That Church was allegorically represented to Zechariah by Joshua the high priest, and might well be spoken of as "the body of Moses" in a day when the Jewish Church had taken up a directly antagonistic position to the Church of Christ, and was continually putting forth its claim to be the Church of Moses.

That such an allegorical expression should in later times have been misunderstood, and the language of allegory should in process of time have been regarded as the language of fact, is only what has occurred in other cases.

Our paper has grown to such an extent that we will not further enlarge it by giving a sketch of the history of the interpretation of the passage. But it should be remembered that the allegorical interpretation of the expression "body of Moses" has also its roots in hoar antiquity (see the *Catena in epist. cath.*, ed. Cramer), and though unpopular among critics of to-day, that view was maintained by Vitringa, Hammond, and others. We do not rest the main stress of our argument in its favour on any conjectures as to what may, or may not, have been contained in the *Assumption of Moses*, although we have called attention to the inherent weakness of the evidence adduced on that head; we rely mainly on the fact that the words quoted by St. Jude in ver. 9 are contained in the special vision of the Book of Zechariah, to which the Apostle refers no less than twice in ver. 23 of his short Epistle.

## THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

### THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION AND MODERN THOUGHT.

BY PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D.D., EDINBURGH.

I PROPOSE in this article to offer some suggestions on a question by no means new in itself, but which a recent ecclesiastical decision in Germany has again brought into prominence—the question, viz., How far the miraculous conception is an essential part of the faith of the Church about Christ? The decision I refer to is that in the case of a talented young Würtemberg pastor—Herr Schrempf—who a year ago was deposed by his ecclesiastical superiors for his refusal to use the so-called Apostles' Creed in the public service of baptism. This case of Schrempf naturally excited much interest, and has called forth a somewhat warm controversy in which Harnack and other writers of a Ritschian tendency have taken a leading part. The controversy has gradually widened out into one of principle, involving the attitude of the Church to the Apostles' Creed generally, and specially raising the question of how far belief in the miraculous conception is of the essence of Christian faith.

In dealing with this question it is important to guard ourselves against ambiguity. At first sight it might appear as if it were less faith in Christ that was at stake than faith in the two particular narratives of the Gospels which record this supernatural occurrence. These narratives might conceivably be regarded as legendary additions to the original Apostolic tradition—attempts on the part of the Church to explain the wonderful impression which Christ's Person made upon it,—and yet faith in Christ Himself, as respects the main features of His character and claims, might be thought not to be affected. This is, in fact, the attitude taken up towards these narratives by many critics and theologians whose Christianity I do not dream of doubting. The immediate object of faith, they contend, is Christ's Person—Christ Himself; whether He came into the world in a supernatural manner is a secondary question to be decided on historical grounds, and on which individuals will hold different opinions according to their views of the worth of the tradition. One need not, however, either doubt the *bona fides* of the theologians who take up this attitude, nor dispute the soundness of their general position, that the immediate object of faith is Christ Himself, and not the manner of His origin, in order to remain unconvinced that faith in Christ and the doctrine of His supernatural birth are really so loosely related as they suppose. It may very well be that Christ's Person is the direct and immediate object of faith, and yet that, in the nature and reality of things, the supernatural birth is the necessary presupposition of that Person, and therefore a fact which faith, whether at first it realizes all that is implied in it or not, is vitally concerned in holding fast.

In the mind of the early Church there was no dubiety on the question

here raised. An instinct which we may pardonably regard as a sound one led it to place the supernatural birth among the few fundamental articles of its earliest creed—the much contested “Apostolicum.” “Born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary,” reads that symbol in its oldest (Roman) form. We need not suppose that this article was introduced simply because of the two narratives of the supernatural birth in Matthew and Luke. Its presence there is due much more to the sound instinctive perception of the collective Church that this article was vital to its faith in Christ as Saviour and Lord, and in this light the testimony of the Creed is still of value to us. It is noteworthy that the newly discovered Apology of Aristides and the Epistles of Ignatius likewise include the Virgin-birth among the fundamental facts of Christianity. This faith of the early Church remained practically unchallenged for centuries. Only one (Judaizing) section among the Ebionites, and Cerinthus and the Carpocratians among the Gnostics, are known to have denied it. Now, however, it is impossible not to recognize that there is a wide-spread drift in the opposite direction. That it should be so where the sinlessness of Christ, and the supernatural aspects of His character and work, are rejected, as, *e.g.*, by Strauss and Renan, is not wonderful. But even within the Church, from Schleiermacher downwards, the tendency has been strong to dispute the historical character of the narratives of the miraculous conception, and to treat the belief in the fact as at least unessential.

1. Critically, the tendency is to regard the narratives as legendary. Thus, *e.g.*, Meyer, Ewald, Beyschlag, Keim, &c.

2. Dogmatically, the belief is treated as unessential. Thus, *e.g.*, by Meyer on Matt. i., and now very emphatically by writers of the Ritschlian school.

3. Scientifically, it is held to be inadmissible. This, however, is dangerous ground to take. Professor A. B. Bruce well points out the issues in his recent work on Apologetics. “A sinless man,” he says, “is as much a miracle in the moral world as a virgin-birth is a miracle in the physical world. If we are to hold a speculative view of the universe which absolutely excludes miracle, then we must be content with a Christianity which consists in duly appreciating a great but not perfect character, or cease to profess Christianity at all. If, on the other hand, to satisfy the demands of our religious nature we insist on retaining the moral miracle, then we must provide ourselves with a theory of the universe wide enough to make room for as much of the miraculous element as may appear to the wisdom of God necessary for realizing His great end in creating and sustaining the universe” (p. 410).

The case of Pastor Schrempf has been referred to above. It need not be overlooked, however, that even this case only brings to a sharper and more public issue a difference of view which has long been agitating the Continental Churches, and which sooner or later required to be faced, together with the estimate of Christianity which it involves. It is seven-

teen years since Dr. Philip Schaff wrote in his *Creeds of Christendom*, "It is characteristic that, while the Church of England is agitated by the question of continuing simply the obligatory use of the *Athanasian Creed*, the Protestant Churches on the Continent are disturbed by the more radical question of setting aside the *Apostles' Creed* for teaching what is said to be contrary to the spirit of the age. Lisco and Sydow, in Berlin, have taken special exception to the clause 'conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,' and maintain, in the face of St. Matthew and St. Luke, that Jesus was 'the legitimate Son of Joseph and Mary'" (i., p. 20).

On the critical aspect of the question I have at present nothing to say. For what may be urged in reply to the critical objections, I may refer to Weiss, Lange, Neander, &c. Only it is important to recognize, even in this regard, that if the narratives of the supernatural birth are rejected, the alternative which has to be confronted is that of deliberate fiction—for unconscious myth and legend are here quite out of place. But this is an alternative from which, when it is fairly faced, most reverent minds will shrink. My immediate purpose, however, is not to discuss the critical objections, but rather to consider the underlying premiss of the critical objections—namely, the idea that the supernatural birth is a thing indifferent to the substance of the Christian faith. I propose to ask whether this is so, or whether it is not the case that this miraculous fact is a necessary presupposition of the faith we have in Christ as the Holy One of God and the Divine Redeemer of the race. It is, in other words, the dogmatic, rather than the critical, aspect of the subject I propose to look at.

Here, again, there are certain lines of argument belonging to the old dogmatic modes of thought which I would at once set aside. From the point of view of the federal theology, e.g., the miraculous conception was necessary in order to secure the Person of the Redeemer from participation in the guilt of Adam's first transgression, with its entail of original sin and other penal effects on all descending from him by ordinary generation. In virtue of His exceptional origin, Christ is regarded as outside the sphere of this *damnosa haereditas*. He is not an ordinary member of the race, but a supernatural addition to it; an incomer into it, or graft upon it from without, and therefore not involved in its Adamic liabilities. As thus free from sin and hereditary guilt, He is able to undertake man's redemption. I am far from saying that the idea at the bottom of these representations is altogether a false one, but I do not undertake the discussion of them here. The line I mean to pursue is different, and more in accordance with the ruling ideas of our own time. I wish to ask, How far does the simple fact of a new creative origin such as we have in Christ—of a sinless Personality—or on the higher level of faith, of the union of the Godhead with humanity in the Incarnation, involve a supernatural act in the production of Christ's bodily nature?

Before answering this question in respect to the second Adam I would go back for a moment or two on certain problems suggested by modern

inquiry respecting the first Adam, or what is called in modern parlance "The Evolution of Man." The whole drift of modern science, as every one now is aware, is to seek an explanation of the production of living organisms—and as the highest of these, of man—in accordance with the laws of evolution. But in the process of this inquiry along the lines of science itself certain difficulties emerge. 1. First, there is the difficulty of explaining satisfactorily the mode or laws, or what are deemed by Mr. Spencer the "factors" of evolution. 2. There is the difficulty of applying the conception of evolution to the world without being compelled to recognize the existence of new beginnings, e.g., the origin of life, of consciousness, &c. 3. Above all, there is the difficulty of giving a satisfactory account of the origin of rational and moral life in man. It is well known that this is the point at which Dr. A. R. Wallace in his work on *Darwinism* specially feels the need of a supernatural cause (pp. 473-76). I may cite, however, a more recent work bearing on this particular subject—I refer to Professor H. Calderwood's volume on *Evolution and Man's Place in Nature*. The main, and, as I think, irrefragable thesis throughout this volume is, that while the doctrine of evolution may be admitted (Dr. Calderwood thinks must be admitted) in the organic sphere, it fails utterly to explain the origin of life and mind, and, above all, the rational and spiritual life of man as the highest being in nature, and the connecting link between the natural and the spiritual worlds. His position is concisely summed up in the following sentences:—

"Research, extended over the wide field of comparative biology, has accumulated a large body of evidence demonstrating the impossibility of tracing the origin of man's rational life to evolution from a lower life. There are no physical forces in nature sufficient to account for the appearance of this life. The insufficiency of the evidence for its evolution becomes increasingly obvious as the demands are more exactly ascertained. Animal intelligence shows no effective preparation for rational intelligence . . . . nor can the characteristics of rational life be explained by any possible advance in the structure of nerves and brain. . . . The rational life of man stands out to view on an eminence completely severed from this scheme of organic evolution. As animal life—a type of physical existence—human life is fitted into the system of organic life on the earth. As a rational life—a type of spiritual existence—human life is exalted above all life besides, severed from the companionship of animals" (pp. 387-8).

Now, it is noteworthy that many of the writers who take this view seem willing to concede that, while man's mind cannot be accounted for by the processes of Darwinian evolution, his physical nature may be accounted for by these processes. I am not sure whether this is the position of Professor Calderwood in the work above cited, but there are some passages which would suggest that it is. Dr. Wallace, at one time at least, held that exceptional causes are implied in the production of man's body, as well as of his mind. (See his essay on "The Limits of Natural Selection as applied to Man" in his *Contributions to the Theory of Natural Selection*.) If he has not changed these views, he does not, at any rate, urge them in his recent work. But the point I wish to press here is that the view which postulates a supernatural cause for the mind of man and hands over his body to the ordinary processes of evolution is

untenable. For see the difficulty in which such a view lands itself. It is a corollary from the known laws of the connection of mind and body that every mind needs an organism fitted to it. If the mind of man is the product of a new cause, the brain, which is the instrument of that mind, must share in its peculiar origin. The higher mind cannot be put into the simian brain. From the human brain to the ape brain there is, as science tells us, "an abrupt fall," and no links have yet been discovered to fill up the gap between. Evolution, on the theory in question, has brought up the brain of man's simian ancestor to a given point; then a higher cause comes in to endow the creature with rational powers separated by a wide gulf from the degree of intelligence previously possessed. But of what use would these powers be if a corresponding rise did not take place on the organic side? And on the terms of the hypothesis, natural evolution has no means within itself to effect that rise. The conclusion we are driven to is that the production of a higher type of organism—the distinctively human—is the correlative of the creation of the higher type of mind, and a special supernatural act is needed for both.

Now, let us apply this analogy with all reverence to the greater mystery—the production of the bodily nature of the second Adam. Here, again, we have a creative beginning. On the lowest supposition compatible with Christian faith we have in Christ a perfect human soul—flawless—one standing in such unique relation to God that a perfect sonship is the result. On the higher ground of faith we have the entrance of a Divine Being into humanity—the Incarnation of the Son. But a perfect soul such as we have in Christ, to go no higher for the present, implies a perfect organism. Moreover, in its place in history such a soul is a moral miracle. It is not to be accounted for out of historical evolution. It transcends the past; is lifted clean above it; is not to be explained by factors already in existence. Whence, then, the organism that clothes it, and serves as its perfect medium of expression? Whence this sudden rise from the imperfect to the absolute in humanity, from the impure and sin-tainted to the absolutely pure? This rise, as we saw before, cannot be on the spiritual side alone; it involves the organic as well. There must be a suitable humanity on the physical side to match the perfection of the Spirit. I would not simply say, therefore, with Professor Bruce, in the words above quoted, that "a sinless man is as much a miracle in the moral world as a virgin-birth is a miracle in the physical world," but I would say that the moral miracle, from its very nature, implies the concurrence of a physical one. This is where Meyer, and all who would make light of the physical miracle, seem to me to err. They recognize a Divine act in the Incarnation on its spiritual side, but do not seem to perceive that this "mystery of godliness" necessitates a special cause operating on the physical side as well. The origin of one like Christ is, view it as we will, a miracle. A new power comes with Him into humanity. The words of the annunciation to Mary are to this hour the most scientific expression of what we must acknowledge as involved in the birth of the

Redeemer—"The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God" (Luke i. 35, R.V.).

The view here taken is strengthened if we observe how commonly in practice belief in the miraculous conception and in the sinlessness of Jesus stand or fall together. There is much truth in what Professor Bruce says, "It has to be remembered that faith is ever in a state of unstable equilibrium while the supernatural is dealt with eclectically; admitted in the moral and spiritual sphere, denied in the physical. With belief in the virgin-birth is apt to go belief in the virgin-life, as not less than the other a part of that veil that must be taken away that the true Jesus may be seen as He was—a morally defective man, better than most, but not perfectly good" (*Apologetics*, p. 410). I have sought to show a yet deeper ground for this, viz., that the virgin-life drives us back upon a supernatural origin even in the sphere of the organic. Professor Bruce, indeed, says on a previous page, "Under what conditions such a sinless Christ is possible is a very important question, but it belongs to theology rather than to religion" (p. 409). But it only does not belong to religious faith so long as faith does not clearly recognize its own presuppositions.

I am far, therefore, from being prepared to concede that this article of the miraculous conception is an unessential one, or one which can be dropped without injury out of the Apostles' Creed. The objection naturally which will be made to the above line of argument is that at most it proves the existence of a supernatural factor in Christ's birth, but not necessarily the virgin-birth of the Gospels. This is the position taken up apparently by the writer of a conciliatory article on the "Apostolicum" question in the pages of the Ritschlian journal, *Die christliche Welt* (Oct. 27th, 1892). This writer, Professor D. Fricke, of Leipzig, cannot understand why any one should take offence at the article of the Creed, "conceived by the Holy Ghost." For if there is agreement that Jesus Christ is the incomparable One, who has the Spirit "without measure," and that from the root of His life outwards, how could He have been otherwise conceived and born than in the power of the Most High, the power of the Holy Ghost? Neither would he stumble at the clause, "born of the Virgin Mary," but he objects to any one dragging down this, which he grants to be a Scriptural expression and thought, into the physiological. This would be to overlook the fact that God acts only on the ground of His own natural order, never without it, or against it. He would interpret the expression, therefore, as simply meaning that the humanity which was to be redeemed could not produce the Redeemer from its own power, else it would have redeemed itself, and not have needed the Son of God. Now, it may be impossible to show *a priori* that the supernatural birth necessarily implies a virgin-birth; but on the other hand, if the fact of a supernatural factor in the earthly origin of Jesus is admitted—and, with all respect to Professor Fricke, this amounts to a physical miracle—all *a priori* objection to the virgin-birth vanishes. The record in the Gospels

simply supplies, in the form of history, what faith on its own grounds demands. The history becomes, therefore, credible and worthy of all acceptation. For that at which naturalism stumbles in the Synoptic narrative undoubtedly is not simply the parthenogenesis, but the idea of miraculous conception in any form. If once it is granted that a new creative cause enters into the production of Christ's humanity, what is there any longer incredible in the supposition that this should supersede the ordinary natural cause in the manner which the Synoptics represent? I conclude that the narratives of the nativity—which in their ground-traits could only have come from the virgin-mother herself—are entirely in keeping with that which faith demands as the presupposition of its own assertions on the Person and character of the Son of God, and that the supernatural conception is rightly regarded as an essential part of the Christian creed.

## CURRENT AMERICAN THOUGHT.

**THE CONSERVATION OF THE FAMILY.** By Pres. J. E. RANKIN, D.D. (*Christian Thought*).—The family is the only institution which came directly from the hand of God. It is the institution which has in itself the beginnings of all other institutions, the potentialities of the human race. A phenomenal man can usually be accounted for, not by looking at his period, his country, his political environment, however much these may have to do with him, but at his family, and especially at his maternal origin. The method of Sparta, taking children and youth and training them up for the State, was contrary to their first and highest interests. It was a sure way for the State to destroy itself in destroying the family. The State has not that to give which the youth of humanity requires. And the same is true of the Church. Civilization rises or falls with the condition of the family. For the citizen is made in the family. One husband, one wife, this is the unit of the Creator. "In getting one's conception of the nature of marriage vows from French and Russian, nay, from English and American novels, and not from the law of God; in selfish and luxurious ideas of what this life is; in despising the sacred dignity and glory of motherhood; in a word, in departing from the Bible standards respecting marriage, are the beginnings of danger to the family."

Another danger comes from the modern Church and its methods, from its complicated organizations and its exhaustive social demands. The attractions which once bound the son to his home now draw him away to some more inviting centre. He leaves the atmosphere of home, where the parental eye is upon him, where the maternal wing covers him, to breathe that of young people whose moral standards are yet hesitating and unconfirmed, are yet in flux. He does not take his cue in life from those who love him best; to whom he owes his birth, and who have prayed for him in his infancy; but from the young people, who are let loose as he is, prematurely to influence and direct each other. In many a household the children are merely temporary sojourners in their own home, because of the demands of some social, humanitarian, or Christian organization connected with

the modern Church. To every family the home life is first in value, and should be the first cared for. To care first for the home life in any community is to care first for the Church life there; and to undermine the home life there is to do the greatest injury to the Church life. "Where is the Church if the family is gone?"

Another danger to the family comes from non-religious social organizations. The great stores have club-houses for their patrons; the great industries for their representatives; and all of the great philanthropic causes, from that of Temperance to that of Women's Rights. Nearly all the modern organizations are along social lines, in which there can be no recognition of the family.

Another danger, and perhaps the most imminent of all, is the great ease with which a divorce may now be secured, which is always the breaking up of a family. It may be asked whether God's law "let not man put asunder" can be applied to unequal and infelicitous marriages? But it must be answered, that the inhibition relates not to any particular marriage, but to all marriages; and that all burdens should be borne rather than the bond be severed. Ease of divorce is the result of certain imperfect views of marriage. If men and women enter the marriage relation with the conception that it is an institution of God, that it was intended by Him to be as sacred as life itself, and to be guarded in purity and duration, as life is guarded, the thought of divorce will awaken only abhorrence. It is the desecration of two lives. And who will venture to say that this was not the Creator's idea? the Saviour's idea? and ought not to be the Christian idea?

Something needs to be said of the necessities of those families which require the premature services of children as wage-earners. Children are taken from school, if not from the nursery, and put into the factories, to help support the household. Where there is solid character, a heritage of moral worth and integrity, this sometimes makes the better manhood. But often it is not so. The boy thus prematurely exposed has matured only in vices; has learned the ways of a man in evil. And it may be added, as another aspect of the sociological question, that the modern club-house, where bachelors try to find a substitute for home life, is a confession of selfishness and meanness, and an undervaluation of the spirit of self-sacrifice in woman.

We must recognize the peril in which the family, as an institution, now lies. There is not a good institution, nor a good movement, which does not directly or indirectly depend upon the family, and make drafts upon it. These may be necessary, but they are too often, in our time, emphasized beyond their deserts. Let things return to their proper proportions. It belongs to the Christian Church first of all to protect the family. It must guard it as a man guards the apple of his eye. "The pulpit must utter the voice of God on the sanctity of the family; on the duties which belong to married life; on the blessings which spring from the parenthood; on the formative power of the home life upon children; on the promises of God to a well-ordered family; on the importance of the family to the Church and to the State, to Society itself. In a word, the pulpit must begin to make family life the central thing; put it where God has put it. And Christian ministers need to make their practice, as to re-marrying persons who have been divorced, square with the strictest Christian standards. If they become careless about whom they marry, they will soon not dare to preach the truth; and the Churches will soon be filled with divorced men and women, who will not listen to the truth. Ministers, and all Christians too, should dissuade those unequally yoked together from regarding divorce as the only remedy for their burdens. The law of Christ is very often fulfilled by bearing the burdens of an unequal marriage. Ease and comforts in life are not the only ends to be sought.

**THE WEAKNESS OF AGNOSTICISM.** By Rev. L. THEODORE CONRAD, B.D. (*Christian Thought*).—Perhaps no anti-Christian belief is working more shipwreck of faith, and reckless indifference to sacred obligations, than the system known as Agnosticism; and specially associated with the name of Mr. Herbert Spencer. But if the fallacies of the fundamental principles of Agnosticism could be clearly shown as they really are, that belief would soon become a curious relic of the past, and be of no further interest in the future than to represent one of the necessary stages through which mind had to pass, in its evolution, in the progress and civilization of the race. The theory of this belief has one great central pillar upon which the whole system rests, if rest it does; and if it can be shown not to rest on this support, then truly it does not rest at all. Theism and Agnosticism need not disagree until they come to a final and efficient cause, the force that produces all manifestations called phenomena. Here the two philosophies take issue. Theism calls it the All-pervading Spirit, the Infinite and Absolute God. Agnosticism admits a force behind all phenomena, but declares that we cannot know a single attribute it possesses. It is the Unknown and Unknowable.

It is argued that all our knowledge is only relative, and that things in themselves we can never know. Spencer says, "It is thus manifest, even if we could be conscious of the Absolute, we could not possibly know that it is the Absolute; and as we can be conscious of an object, as such, only by knowing it to be what it is, this is equivalent to an admission that we cannot be conscious of the Absolute at all. As an object of consciousness, everything must necessarily be relative; and what a thing may be out of consciousness, no mode of consciousness can tell us." But Spencer finds it absolutely necessary to use that Absolute, which he maintains can never be known, in order to support his theory. He sees that a thing cannot well be related without being related to something, and that there cannot be any relative knowledge without there is, at the same time, an Absolute, any more than there can be a positive without a negative, a long without a short, a north without a south, or a finite without an Infinite. He therefore conjures up a very peculiar theory, by which he would convince of the possibility of at once being without any knowledge of the Absolute, and at the same time having a certain positive "undefined consciousness of its existence." But such a theory is manifestly self-destructive.

To say that we cannot *know* the Absolute is by implication to affirm that there is an Absolute. In the very denial of our power to learn what that Absolute is, there lies hidden the assumption that it is, and this proves that the Absolute has been present to the mind, not as a nothing, but as a something. Any conception of the finite and relative implies a conception of the Infinite and Absolute; and the knowledge of the one must of necessity be equally clear and positive with the other. Of two correlatives, you cannot have a distinct knowledge of the one and an imperfect knowledge of the other. But to hold to the relativity of knowledge and the unknowable on the one hand, and, at the same time, to admit that we have any consciousness of the Absolute whatever, is not only utterly irreconcilable, but even absurd. Either all knowledge is relative, or it is not relative, and the Absolute is either known and knowable, or unknown and unknowable. No half-way position can here be maintained, but if it were "unknown and unknowable," then we could have no consciousness of it whatever, either definite or indefinite, for so soon as it is consciousness in the true sense, it is also knowledge, and nothing less than positive knowledge.

Entire relativity of knowledge can never be maintained. If you claim it *with* a knowledge of the Absolute, here is a contradiction already. For you must conceive

of the Absolute under conditions, you know it only in part, and hence you do not know it as an Absolute at all. If you claim the relativity of knowledge with the view of the Absolute as "unknown and unknowable," then, so far as we are concerned, there is no Absolute, and as a consequence again, no relativity. If our minds are for ever confined within the limited sphere of the relative, we could not only never have the faintest idea of the Absolute, but we could never even know that we are thus confined within the relative. No more could we know this than a man confined to total darkness from his birth could of himself know that he was in the dark. In like manner, some beings having more senses than we, or of superior intelligence, might look down upon us from superhuman heights, and see clearly and inform us, that our minds are for ever circumscribed by the limits of the relative, and that far beyond is a Great First Cause, which we can never know; but without such a revelation from a higher source, we would not only ever be ignorant of such a First Cause, but must also for ever remain absolutely unconscious of our own ignorance.

**THE TRIPLE STANDARD IN ETHICS.** By GEORGE BATCHELOR, Lowell, Mass. (*The New World*).—Progress is the best test or standard of conduct. "Happiness," "utility," "well-being," "the general welfare," and all similar words or phrases fail somewhere in an all-round application. By the use of the word "progress," we are relieved once for all from the equivocal and confusing suggestions and half-truths which attend the direct pursuit of happiness for ourselves, and the direct attempt to procure happiness for others. We also have a test for "utility" itself. What is useful? Clearly that which tends to increase the quantity and improve the quality of sentient being in myself or in others. In all ages there has been practical agreement as to what constitutes moral progress. That evolution of the race which we now recognize and describe has always been a fact of experience, and has always been made a test of conduct. From brute to man the passage is direct and every step is known.

What are the moral standards which are actually present to the minds of men, and how is moral force generated? Much of the confusion which marks all ethical speculation is the result of mistaking standards and tests for sources and causes. Weights, measures, gauges, metres, are all useful as tests of quality and quantity, but they produce nothing. They are useful for classification, for moral science, but they add nothing to the moral force of society, and do not show how such force may be generated. There are three moral standards which are in universal use. (1) *External Authority.* Whether rightly or wrongly, nearly all men do actually acknowledge some authority external to themselves; some rule of conduct which is imposed on them from without. This external authority may be regarded as the only source and standard of right conduct. But with the advance of thought it becomes less and less imperative, because the reason of mankind seeks for a rational explanation of all law, even the Divine law. Hence there comes into view a second standard by which the first is tested. By a natural instinct of optimism, it is taken for granted that whatever is enjoined by external authority is, or ought to be, for the general good. (2) *Social Utility.* This becomes a test of action in all the relations between the one and the many. He who does that which is useful to society is approved by others, and is not condemned by himself. So long as he works for social utility there can be no taint of selfishness in motive or conduct. But, like the first standard, this is external to the individual. In the one case, he refers to a law behind and above his own personality. In the other, he takes account of an object outside of and beyond his own being and welfare. But in every moral judgment, motive, and action there is involved another element. (3) *The Personal Ideal.* This is complex, as complex as the

human personality which it represents. But it enters as a unit into every moral affirmation. It is denoted by the personal pronoun. When a man says "I ought," the meaning depends on the value he assigns to the "I." "The Personal Ideal is the product of innate qualities, of personal experience, of training and discipline received from others, of the inherited traditions of society, of all the sentiment, passion, poetry, and emotional power which enter into one's personality, and affect one's estimate of himself. Whatever moral energy any one may generate will shape itself into conscience, motive, sentiment, means, and consequence, with a different pattern for each individual." Any man wishing to take a right course will make a threefold calculation as to the general obligation, the special emergency, and his own private relation to them. Of this threefold standard the Personal Ideal is one of the most important parts.

How does this Ideal originate? What is the part it plays in the conduct of life? And what the opportunity it affords for moral education? Two mistakes are constantly made in the attempt to reduce ethics to practice. The first is to suppose that words and ideas are the most effective means of shaping the moral life of Society. The second is to suppose that a metre has any especial value except in minor matters of discipline and regulation. Ideas govern the world in time. Not, however, because they are received and acted upon as ideas, but because, by their aid, better conditions are provided for the development of moral power. Metres also have value, but they only show the quantity and quality of a given force. They do not generate it.

The attempt has been made to elevate to the dignity of a system that which is natural, fitting, becoming, and in accordance with human nature. But it has always been difficult to discover what is natural, fitting, and becoming to a human being. *The Precepts of Ptah-Hotep* is the oldest book in the world. It is supposed to have been written some four thousand years before Christ. In it, as now, the will of the gods, and the needs of men, were constantly recognized as guides to conduct; but the standard of personal righteousness is also set up, and in no doubtful way. From the time of Ptah-Hotep on through the literature of the ancient world, one who looks for it may find abundant evidence of the recognition of a personal standard of righteousness. "Strong men out of ample experience learned to recognize themselves as sources of moral power, and to set up for themselves standards of conduct by which they estimated, not only their obligations and the needs of society, but also what was fitting, honourable, and right for themselves to do." When once the personal standard of righteousness is accepted, it will seem to be most important. When the sense of personal honour is well developed, one trusts it instinctively. If what purports to be a Divine law seems to a man to involve for himself degradation and dishonour, he rejects the law, or he studies it anew, to see if it be rightly delivered, or be of Divine origin. If social demands are made upon him which involve the loss of his self-respect, he will refuse to accede to the demand, or seek to modify it. "In our time, the extraordinary *usefulness* of right conduct has drawn attention away from its moral beauty." The aesthetics of moral conduct have always attracted attention. "Virtue is its own reward" is a true saying when understood in its original sense. In all works of art, moral perfection enters as an element of beauty, loved for its own sake. So in all human life, moral perfection is recognized as the subtle grace of harmony, the equal poise of well-used faculties working together. Moral health, the glow of joyous exercise, the satisfactions of a conscience void of offence and quick with active enterprise, are enjoyed for their own sake, and may be quite apart from and unlike peace with God and one's fellow-men.

While this ideal is properly described as personal to each human being, yet all individuals fall into classes, and may be considered in groups. The hereditary, traditional, and other social affairs and events out of which any personal ideal may come, are for each individual well-nigh infinite. 1. There is the Ideal of the Race. White or black, Aryan or Semitic, European or African, are words which indicate for all the individuals denoted by them mighty streams of hereditary tendency and traditional influence. 2. The Ideal of the Nation. Whether one be Assyrian, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, German, Frenchman, or American, he will act according to his reason indeed, but under guidance of a conscience modified by the national type of character. 3. The Ideal of the Religion. Buddhist, Jew, Christian, Mohammedan, Catholic, Protestant, represent forms of character and standards of living which *may* go along the lines of the race or nation, but which often have power to cross them. 4. The Ideal of the Guild. This word is used to indicate a force which is just now manufacturing morals for social use at a lively rate. "Every profession, trade, calling, occupation, of whatever kind, carries with it of necessity a bundle of traditions, necessary habits, forms of thought, modes of feeling, codes of conduct, types of character, by which individual members of the guild judge themselves and one another." 5. The Ideal of the Family. The most powerful of all special influences is that of the family life and tradition. The name one bears, with the traditions connected with it, will often determine the quality of one's ethical conduct.

The personal ideal, however refined by culture and differentiated and specialized by civilization, must always, for the intelligent, be accepted as the personal expression of the universal type. What one thinks of human nature, its origin, its kinships, its destiny, will powerfully affect his own estimate of himself, and his calculation of that which is due to other beings. Whatever system of philosophy one may adopt, the simple task of the ethical philosopher is to discover how to arrange the conditions which are favourable to high ideals. The ethical task of civilization is clearly to present the objects of conduct, and to state the principles which should be the guides of action; but, above all, to show what conditions are favourable to the growth of healthy, happy, sound moral natures in men and women taken as they are. The standard to which in every case final appeal is made is that which one thinks to be right, proper, becoming, and of obligation for himself.

Moral education consists in the use of means fitted to produce in an individual a right personal ideal to be the standard of his conduct. Society unconsciously makes use of such means. When society comes to a clear understanding of the nature of these means, and the best methods of applying them, moral education will proceed at a rapid rate. The means at the disposal of society are chiefly three. 1. Natural and rational selection applied before the birth of the individual in the choice of parents. 2. Natural and rational selection applied after the birth of the individual, in the arrangement of external conditions which call out and exercise desirable qualities, repressing and discouraging those which are not wanted. 3. Direct training applied to the reason and conscience of the individual.

THE RESTORATION OF PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. By B. B. TYLER (*The New Christian Quarterly*).—By "Primitive Christianity" is meant the Christianity of Christ and His elect ambassadors—the Christianity of the New Testament—not that of the first three centuries: and the question is, How far is the restoration of Primitive Christianity desirable and practicable? All Protestants appeal to the New Testament teaching concerning what men ought to believe; and in support of their creeds and confessions of faith. And all Protestants seem to be trying to get back to Primitive

Christianity. The appeal in the search after truth and right is with one voice to Jesus and the Apostles.

But how far is a restoration of Christianity according to the Christ practicable? Take the case of the kiss of charity. Five times it is enjoined as a mode of salutation. It is urged by some that this frequent repetition of a command or exhortation, to greet one another with a kiss of charity, compels the belief that this manner of salutation was to continue among the saints in all places and through all time. There is to-day at least one religious denomination in which the disciples of our Lord greet each other with a kiss of charity. Why do not *we*, who appeal to the New Testament to find authority for our religious faith and life? Is the observance of the communion of the body and blood of Christ five times enjoined in Epistles addressed by inspired Apostles to Churches of Christ?

Some, also, who desire in all things to conform to the teaching and commandments of our Lord, practise the washing of feet as a religious ceremony. Jesus said, "Ye ought to wash one another's feet." What right, it is asked, has any man, or any number of men, however learned or consecrated, to directly or indirectly nullify this injunction, this explicit and positive injunction of the Christ? Moreover, the Son of Man seemed to make the washing of feet a saving ordinance, for He says, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me." No such emphasis is placed on baptism, in any word spoken by our Lord, as is placed on the washing of one another's feet; and yet all Protestants, with the exception of the Society of Friends, hold and teach that baptism is an ordinance of Jesus Christ to be observed by His disciples to the end of time. Our fathers reasoned out this subject, and it seemed to them that neither the kiss of charity nor the washing of the saints' feet really belonged to ancient Christianity, the Christianity to which they desired to return; they were social customs and observances of the age, and not religious ceremonies.

Still, there is among us the conception of the New Testament as a statute book, filled with specific rules and regulations intended to govern the conduct of the disciples of Jesus, even as the Pentateuch is full of specific laws for the government of the disciples of Moses. "When our fathers started to feel their way through the religious and theological mists and clouds by which they were surrounded, some of them sought, as do their children to-day, to find in the teaching of the Master the specific details of worship and of work; and this embodies their idea of what is meant by the restoration of Primitive Christianity." But this rests upon a fallacy: "The New Testament contains no liturgy, no congregational service. None of the circumstantials of the Christian worship are laid down in the New Testament."

The religion of the Son of Man is supernatural in origin, and because of the supernatural elements in the Christianity of the Apostolic Age, some think that a restoration of Primitive Christianity means a return of such exhibitions of Divine power as is properly named miraculous. But is this correct? God at the first set in the Church "apostles," "prophets," "teachers," "miracles," "gifts of healing," "helps," "governments," "diversities of tongues." By what authority, then, are the "gifts" of the Holy Spirit eliminated, these offices abolished, and these officers turned out? It is asked, Will not this power, which was a part of the life of the Church at the beginning, when the Lord's people shall have returned in all things to the Christianity of the New Testament, be again a feature of Church life? The "Catholic Apostolic Church" contends that all the officers mentioned in connection with the New Testament Church ought to be

found in the modern Church; and that with this restoration of Christianity according to Christ will come a renewal of the mighty powers with which, at least, some of the early disciples were endowed. Is this contention well founded? Is it warranted by New Testament teaching? According to St. Paul, there is something better than the possession and exercise of even the best of such spiritual gifts as are by him enumerated in writing to the Corinthians. He affirms the failure, or passing away, of prophecies, miraculous tongues, and supernaturally-communicated knowledge. These strange gifts belong to the childhood estate of Christianity. From the pastoral epistles it is evident that the promise of miraculous aid in thinking, speaking, and acting was not expected to pass over to those who, in the office of the sacred ministry, would come after the Apostles. So far from being powers which were lodged in the Church because of the perfection of faith, of character, and of organization, they were given in accommodation to the spiritual weaknesses and imperfections of the early disciples of Christ. Crutches are for the lame.

But is it not desirable that the original organization of the Church should be re-established? We reply, that there is nothing in the New Testament about the organization of the Church, using the word "Church" in its largest significance. We read of the "Churches of Galatia," but not of "the Church of Galatia." These congregations were one in faith, one in hope, and one in love; but if they were one in organization, the Holy Spirit, in the New Testament, is silent on the subject.

The essential feature, that which is at once and equally desirable and practicable in the restoration of Primitive Christianity, is that men shall be brought, in their daily lives, to the experience of the faith, and hope, and love generated by and enjoined in the Gospel of the Son of God. These constitute essential Christianity. This faith is faith in Christ, and nothing more. This hope is the good hope of eternal life through Christ. This love is a divinely-generated love toward God as He manifests Himself in Christ, and toward all men as bearing the image of God.

It is desirable and practicable to restore the whole of *Christianity according to Christ*. But that which is essential, and therefore permanent, in the religion of the Son of Man is summed up in these pregnant words—Faith, Hope, Love. The Founder of the Christian Church taught also appropriate expressions of these sacred experiences, and in the restoration of primitive Christianity a regard must be manifested toward the Master in what He taught on this subject. Baptism, the Lord's Supper, prayer and praise, are specifically named by Jesus and His Apostles, not only as ways of embodying and setting forth before men the faith, and hope, and love experienced, but as means by which this essential Christianity may be, in life, intensified. These expressions, however, are but elementary. The entire life ought, in countless ways, to speak for the facts of our spiritual experience: *I believe; I hope; I love.* To live such lives will be to reproduce in our places and to the extent of our ability the matchless life of the perfect man—Jesus, the Son of Mary, the Son of God.

**THE HUMAN SOUL OF JESUS CHRIST.** By the Very Rev. A. F. HEWITT (*The Catholic World*).—The Catholic dogma of the Incarnation is briefly summed up in this formula: Jesus Christ is One Person, subsisting in two distinct natures, the Divine and the human. He, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, the Only begotten Son of the Father, one with the Father in essence, and equal to Him in all eternal, infinite perfections, assumed a distinct, perfect human nature, into a personal union with His Divinity, and thus became man. It is one and the same Person, who is both God and Man; who created the world, and who died on the cross. By Divine wisdom and power,

attributes of His Divine nature, He created the world. By human faculties, attributes of His human nature, He exercised thought and volition in a human mode; He rejoiced and grieved, loved His own kind with natural affection, lived a sensitive life, obeyed and merited, gave Himself up to suffering and the death of the cross. The heresies that have arisen have attacked the Divinity, or the humanity, or the union between the two. It is only necessary to remind readers of the Arian, Nestorian, Monophysite, Apollinarian, and Monothelite heresies, all of which were condemned by the definitions of the first six councils.

The Divine Person assumed a perfect and individual human nature, excluding all separate human personality. The union of the Divine and human in Christ is called Hypostatic, from the Greek term *hypostasis*, of which the Latin term *persona*, with its derivatives, is the equivalent. In this hypostatic union, each remains what it is in itself, the Divine purely Divine, the human purely human. The human nature is essentially and principally rational. Human nature is composed of a rational soul and an organized body. The logical definition of man is *rational animal*. *Animal* gives his genus, *rational* his specific difference. In the hypostatic union there are two spiritual intellectual substances, co-existing but distinct, both terminating in one personal subsistence. But this is the great mystery of the Incarnation. We cannot conceive how two intellectual natures can co-exist, distinct and yet united in one personality. What help toward the apprehension is at command?

There is nothing like the union of two natures in Christ in all the range of spiritual being. In the individual man, "nature" and "person" may be distinguishable in the mind, but they are not two distinct entities. But the concept of "person" adds something to the concept of "rational nature." "It expresses a mode of being, in which the human substance, existing *in itself*, as the undermost subject of all its attributions, subsists *by itself*, as its own final and complete term. By virtue of this mode of personal existence, it belongs to itself, has dominion over its free acts, and is the ultimate term to which are referred all its phenomena." "This ultimate principle and term of rational existence is the unchangeable, incommunicable *Ego*, which has nothing back of it, or on a level with it. This is the 'Self,' always fixed in its own identity, the focus of self-consciousness, the actor and the sufferer, in all operations and affections of every part of the nature, mental or bodily." And the human nature of Jesus Christ had in it all the requisites for a separate personality. If this perfect human nature had been left by itself, then a *mere man*, however miraculously formed, would have been born of Mary. But the humanity of Jesus was never for a single instant left by itself, and the mode of personality was not permitted to give it a separate subsistence. "In the act of creation and formation, the Son of God assumed this human nature, gave it a Divine subsistence, and made it the human nature of His Divine Person." The intelligent, free, living soul of Jesus Christ, instead of finding itself at the summit of consciousness terminated to itself, in its own independent possession, with final self-dominion and self-subsistence, brought to a focus in its own proper *Ego*, found itself in contact with a higher, a Divine Person, in whom was its *Ego*. Christ makes no distinction between the Son of God and the Son of Man. The Son of God *was* the Son of Man.

Human psychology presents but one faint analogy to this mystery. "Our *Ego* is in the intellect, the eye, and the hand; it has at once rational and sensitive cognition, is the subject of spiritual and animal life, actions and passions. But this does not come near the inscrutable fact, that One Person elicits acts of infinite and finite intelligence, infinite and finite volitions, acts of Divine and of human love."

The mysteries of the Christian Creed are revealed to faith, which is an assent of the mind exclusively founded on the testimony of God. But the mysteries of faith are not contrary to reason, or completely unintelligible.

Unless Jesus Christ were God, His human character and human acts would not raise Him above the level of the prophets and apostles of God. If His Divinity be denied, we cannot find in the Gospels the picture of the greatest and best of men, for He certainly made pretensions which could not be made by the best of men unless they were absolutely true. If Jesus Christ were not man, He could not be a Mediator, a Saviour, a Brother in blood to all men, the Second Adam, and the Head and King of the human race. His humanity has no ideal beauty, and no significance, except as the humanity of a Divine Person. As that, the Gospels give the portrait of a character of spotless innocence, consummate moral perfection, and entrancing beauty. It is the ideal humanity reduced to actual existence, after a type in the mind of God, which no human mind could have conceived.

"The surpassing loveliness and sublimity of the Gospel portraiture of the character of Jesus Christ proves its authenticity, without any need of extrinsic evidence. Such a portrait was impossible, except as drawn from life. It is the original which is seen clearly reflected in a crystal mirror. This character authenticates itself by its intrinsic perfection. The superhuman sanctity of Jesus Christ, by itself, makes His entire revelation credible. His moral beauty carried away the first Christians with an ardent, enthusiastic love which made the Church and the world incandescent with celestial fire. Its charm seems to grow instead of lessening, as time passes, compelling universal admiration, even from unbelievers."

THE HUMAN ELEMENT IN THE BIBLE. By Rev. D. W. C. HUNTINGTON, Lincoln, Neb. (*Christian Thought*).—There is a human element in the Bible. It is better adapted to its purpose for that reason; possibly it would be of little use to us were the human factor eliminated. It is the Divine-human Book. As the work of the printer and binder, the Bible, in its present form, is manifestly a human work; but printers' mistakes in no way affect the message of God carried to us in it. Our Bible is a translation into English from other languages. The translations have been made by devout and scholarly men, but they were men, with human infirmity. None of them have ever claimed any measure or mode of Divine guidance in their work beyond that which all honest and prayerful men may expect in difficult and responsible undertakings. Clearly, there is a human element in this matter of translating, and the Bible is the better for it. None of the present translations were made from the original documents of the authors. Those originals are hopelessly lost. The copyists, on whom our translators had to rely, were human, and made mistakes; and their copying introduces another human element into the Bible that we have now.

But supposing that we have the correct text of the Bible, is there no human element in this? Is there no blending of life between the source of revelation and the intelligent and responsible media through whom that revelation is communicated? The organs of these revelations were men, not mere tongues, or hands. It was the *whole man* who was used to record the revelation of God. The man as a free personality; the man with his mental constitution, his education, and his spiritual constitution, all entering as modifying influences into his work. The man, with the laws of his being respected, and all his mental and moral faculties in their normal and unconstrained activity. And this must involve a human element in our Bible. Individual peculiarities appear in prophets, evangelists, and apostles as strongly and as naturally as in other writers.

Each has a style of his own, and a tendency to the frequent use of favourite words. There are evidences of different casts of mind, varying degrees of education, and partialities for certain classes of rhetorical figures. Habits of thought and association appear in these as in other men. To thoughtful readers it is plain, that some of the New Testament writers were less familiar with the Old Testament than others; inspiration did not remove this defect in their education. Inspiration did not give to them precise identity of view, to each an equal degree of knowledge, or to any omniscience. In some instances of most sublime prophetic vision, the revelation of truth to the prophet is accompanied at least with study, and in others is acknowledged as given in answer to prayer. Oehler says, "In far the greater number of cases we must evidently conceive of the state in which the prophet receives a revelation as merely one of profound self-introspection and collectedness of mind in a state of perfect wakefulness. This prophetic state is most nearly related to communion with God in prayer." The books of the Bible have what may be called their local and historical settings. Most, if not all, of them appear to have been called forth by some local necessity. Each book has in itself indications of the time and circumstances in which it was written. The rhetorical figures, the allusions to historical events, to domestic and social customs, to natural history and scenery, all suggest a human factor in the authorship, working as we know men's minds now work.

The manner in which the New Testament writers quote from the older Scriptures indicates the action of a free personality. Sometimes they quote from the Hebrew, and at others from the Septuagint; sometimes literally, at others only substantially. The Biblical writers also make a free use of other available materials. They refer to traditions, to documentary evidence, and to the word of living witnesses. Moreover, the inspired writers do not claim either to know or to remember everything. They claim to be inspired, but not to have lost in the inspiration that which made them human, not to have been lifted above, nor out of, the normal use of their intellectual faculties.

Manifestly there is a human element running through the entire Bible. It does not impinge upon the inspiration of the writers, but it does bring the Book of God nearer to us, and it does dispose of many objections to the Divine authenticity of the sacred writings. "What if there should be found errors in genealogical tables, in numbers and architectural measurements? What if the writers of the Bible possessed but imperfect knowledge of the earth and of science? What if copyists have blundered, and revisers have fallen into error? What has all this to do with the great fact that God inspired and called men to speak and write His messages? The Christ of Christianity is the God-man; the Bible of Christianity is the Divine-human Book.

**JEWISH PROPAGANDA IN THE TIME OF CHRIST.** By Rev. BERNARD PICK, Ph.D., Alleghany, Pa. (*The Lutheran Quarterly*).—Christ's words, "Woe unto you scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye compass sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, ye make him twofold more the child of hell than yourselves" (Matt. xxiii. 15), imply that before He gave the great missionary command, a missionary activity was in vogue. It was associated with the Pharisees rather than the Sadducees; and for our knowledge of it we are dependent on the Jewish and Graeco-Jewish literature, and on heathen writers. It is first necessary to consider the political and social position of the Jews in the Graeco-Roman world. The Jews were to be found in all the neighbouring countries. Of this fact we have abundant illustration in the first book of the Maccabees (141 B.C.), in Philo, in Strabo, in the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Talmud. The Assyrian and Babylonian captivity

gave a wholly different impulse to the current of Jewish life. In worldly pursuits the Jews soon became one with the nations among whom they lived, and very few made use of the privilege to return again to their own land. Josephus speaks of the Ten Tribes as dwelling beyond the Euphrates, an immense multitude, not to be estimated by numbers. The conquests of Alexander the Great brought the Jews into contact with the Greek world. It was his ambition to give to the civilized world the unity of a common language: and his successors carried on his policy, and did their utmost to promote the immigration of Jews into Egypt. The contact of Jew with Greek was fruitful of momentous consequences. The vast majority of the Jewish settlers adopted the Greek language, and forgot their Aramaic dialect. These Greek-speaking Jews, called "Hellenists," produced a literature of their own, which is called "Hellenistic," in opposition to the Palestinian literature, because it is written in Greek. From Egypt the Jews spread from the Libyan desert in the North to the borders of Ethiopia in the South; but the greatest number resided in Alexandria, where three worlds met. An attempt was made to raise a rival temple in Egypt. The origin of the Jews in Rome is very obscure. There are traces of them in 139 B.C., but the first settlement of Jews was under Pompey, (B.C. 63), when vast numbers of slaves were brought to the capital. These became freed men, or *liberti*, and soon were reckoned among the unendurable plagues of the capital's life. The principal Jewish quarter of Rome was on the other side of the Tiber, in the poorest and dirtiest portion of the city. They were subject to severe persecutions under Tiberius and Claudius.

We now are prepared to deal with the *Jewish Propaganda*. Wherever the Jews went they adopted the language and customs of the land, but they kept their religion and their patriotism, and their zeal for the conversion of the Gentiles. The Septuagint version, begun in the third century before Christ, became "the first apostle to the Gentiles," a bridge between the Jewish and the Gentile world; by which the religious truths of Judaism became known to the Greek and Roman, and respected by them. Another tendency was the softening of the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic representations of the Deity, of which the translators did not hesitate to be guilty.

The translation of the Old Testament into Greek was, however, only the starting-point of the propaganda. Not satisfied with their political and social position, the Jews now became members of the republic of letters. The religious faith of Israel, its history and its great and sacred past, were now depicted in the forms, and with the means, furnished by the literary culture of the Greeks, and thus made accessible to the whole world. This was done with a self-consciousness and a set purpose in order to beat the enemy on his own ground. For this reason the Graeco-Jewish literature is for the most part practical; its aim is not only to inspire the non-Jewish world with respect for the people and the religion of Israel, but, what is more important, if possible to bring the Gentiles to embrace Judaism. Alexandria became the central place of the Graeco-Jewish literature, which developed itself in various forms. The "Aristeas Letter" is a kind of commentary on the Septuagint. Aristobulus (B.C. 160), the tutor of Ptolemy Euergetes, sought to find the Hebrew religion in the Greek philosophy, and the Greek philosophy in the Hebrew Scriptures. He taught that the sages and poets of Grecian antiquity had but plagiarized their best parts from Moses, or Solomon, or Jeremiah; but he sought to strengthen his cause by the deliberate falsification of Greek literature, making the ancient Gentile poets express the elevated sentiments of Hebrew monotheism. Aristobulus was the inventor of allegorical interpretation.

Another author who wrote to glorify the Jewish nation was Artapanus. In his work he tries to show that the Egyptians were indebted to the Jews for all useful knowledge and institutions. In order to be more successful the propaganda had to use different tactics, and the former skirmishing now made room for more overt attacks. The beginning of these attacks may be found in the oldest pieces of the Sibylline Oracles, composed by an Alexandrian Jew about 140 B.C. His aim was to present the Jewish Messianic hopes and anticipations to the Gentiles in the most vivid colours. "He desired to present to them the picture of a people who, in the most happy peace and under the most righteous laws and the finest morals, were realizing by anticipation the glories of the Messianic reign; to teach them to honour this people, and, if not to be converted to their communion, at least to abstain from molesting and disturbing them; and he had the further design of addressing the Jews or Hellenists who dwelt amid heathen, and easily forgot the import and scope of the Messianic prophecies." Similar is the tone in the *Book of Wisdom*, composed by an Alexandrian Jew in the second century before Christ.

Another mode of making propaganda was the affixing of heathen names to Jewish documents, in order to prove that the more intelligent among the Greeks had already correct views concerning the nature of God, His unity, spirituality, and supramundane character. The documents, as preserved by Christian writers, enable the reader to judge how irreconcilable they were with a heathen authorship. Thus the treatise *De Monarchia*, ascribed to Justin, gives quotations as from Æschylus, and Sophocles, and Orpheus, and Pythagoras, ascribing to them distinctly Jewish sentiments.

The further discussion of this subject, and especially the effects of the propaganda, the author reserves for later treatment.

**THE PROPER ATTITUDE OF CATHOLICS TOWARDS MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM.** By the Very Rev. H. J. D. RYDER (*The Catholic World*).—A prevalent form of anti-Scriptural criticism insists upon having found a human key to the development of the Jewish constitution. According to Wellhausen and others, the Hexateuch in its present form is the outcome of a post-Exilic sacerdotal movement tending to substitute what he calls "the priestly code" for the primitive institution, with the object of offering, under the prestige of antiquity, an effectual resistance to national disintegration. Similarly, critics had frequently attempted to find an adequate explanation of the development of Papal authority in the fifth century in a policy of imperial centralization. Up to a certain point the criticism in both cases may be just. "Believers in the Divinity, both of the Scriptures and of the Church, may admit without difficulty a human element working in subordination to the Divine dispensation, whilst they reasonably refuse to find in it the one adequate explanation of the phenomenon."

Another very common way of treating Scripture is to insist upon assimilating it to other primitive records. Its uniqueness is thus supposed to be lost. Abraham was a Sheik, nay, many Sheiks of the same name or a similar one. Various events in early Jewish history read like the echoes of events in other histories. Which then is the voice, and which the echo? Modern ethnological studies have given a vastly increased impulse and sphere to this argument. But what real cogency has it against the truth of Scripture? There is a likelihood that every product of the garden of humanity should have an analogous growth; that even the growth from a Divine seed should but differentiate itself, without manifesting a character wholly alien from its neighbours.

Another objection is that the morality taught in many parts of Scripture—in

Ecclesiastes, for instance—is defective, and that the moral type apparently presented for our approval, in such characters as Joshua and David, is anything but the high one it ought to be. This objection has its roots in a false appreciation of the position claimed for Holy Scripture in the ethical and religious education of mankind. Scripture is not an ethical primer. It appeals to every motive that is in itself good and honest, whether it be high or low, for it addresses itself to the whole of human nature. "No doubt the Old Testament Scriptures represent a system of ethical accommodation on the part of God to the weaknesses of humanity, and of uncivilized humanity; but all relations between the Creator and the creature involve an accommodation, a dispensation."

Stress is often laid upon the difficulty of supposing that a highly-developed civilization, such as we find in Ancient Egypt, for example, should have arisen and culminated within the period allowed by Biblical chronology. But an indefinite space of time may be allowed, without offence to Scripture veracity, inasmuch as the Bible has, properly speaking, no chronology. These are fair specimens of the Scripture difficulties contributed by modern criticism. Various have been the modes of dealing with Scriptural difficulties at different times within the Church. The system of allegorizing; the mystical sense at times usurping the literal; the interfusion of the poetical or pictorial element in the historical—all tending to show that the Fathers' theory concerning the inspiration was *in fieri* rather than *in factum esse*; whilst their attitude was always dominated by the principle that, granting the inspiration, its largest amplitude was to be assumed in default of proof to the contrary in the particular instance—a principle at once accounting for the predominance in early times of such a theory as that of verbal inspiration, and opening the door to the possibility of future critical development.

It may be pointed out that numberless assertions in Holy Writ take a form incompatible with an acquaintance on the part of the sacred writers with much that we know, and that various statements, though assertive in form, may be regarded as really noncupative rather than assertive, introducing a character or fact with the note attached to it, whether truly or not. Statements corresponding with opinion and not with fact, where the two conflict, must necessarily from time to time occur wherever a Divine message is delivered through human agents to ignorant men, on pain of laying a disquieting and misleading stress upon indifferent matters. Such a view is, indeed, open to serious abuse in its application to particulars; and it may not be possible to confine it to what are commonly considered minute matters.

It was the instinct of uncritical times to find a whole wherever a passage could by itself be made to yield a meaning; and to lose all distinction of emphasis in the one distinguishing emphasis implied in a Divine authorship; but this has gradually yielded to the exigencies of critical development. As regards the theory of *obiter dicta*, or uninspired minutiae, while its tenability may be defended, it may, on the one hand, be extended to matters not in themselves minute; and on the other hand, it must be limited to statements which either the form or the circumstances of the human author should exceptionalize.

There might well be a little more confidence in science, and a little less confidence in scientific men. Of science, accurate knowledge, we cannot have too much; let it prevail, a very sea clipping the rock upon which we of the faith are standing as closely as it may. We welcome it as a most important element in the interpretation of Scripture, though not the only one, and as a factor in the integration of theological thought. We may be sure that no ascertained truth of science can be really antagonistic to our position as believers; and that the God of reason is also

the God of faith. We are all exposed to the action of the *Zeitgeist*, which, though scientifically inclined, is assuredly anything but strictly scientific. "The bane of modern popular science is its unordered diffusiveness, the incompleteness of its view of life, its lack of sobriety, and of that sense of proportion which would enable it to bring its various subject-matters into focus."

INDIVIDUALISM AS A SOCIOLOGICAL PRINCIPLE. By E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, Brown University, Providence, R.I. (*The Yale Review*).—A great extension of its actual work by the public power may be had without at all coddling the citizen; but the extension must be made in right directions, so as to stimulate and increase independence and the spirit of self-help, instead of lessening them. The *laissez-faire* industrial régime has done, and is still doing, much good. Competition has spurred individual initiative, quickened invention, brought out character, augmented production, and it is doing these things still. But the competitive stage of industry is not likely to be the last; one and the same form of economy will not characterize all ages. The open competition system—personal freedom, unlimited property, liberty of commerce, contracts, and migration—is not yet a century old, and only the rudiments of it reach back to the middle age. The industrial civil war, this feverish Ishmaelism in commercial life, cannot last for ever. Already, indeed, a new economic era has opened. The revolt from Manchesterism is the very key to recent political history in Great Britain. There is scarcely a realm of England's industrial life which the legislator has not invaded. All advanced peoples have long been removing species after species of business, from the coining of money to the working of railways, telegraphs, and the express service, out of private into public hands.

We are suffering to-day from that habit of the traditional economic theorizing, unduly to sunder economics and general sociology; and this is unscientific. What will build up the noblest humanity? What use of his powers and environment will bring man the most rational life? These are the questions which economists as well as philanthropists now perforce ask, subordinating considerations of wealth-production, and even of wealth-distribution, to those mighty moral and sociological inquiries. The phrase *laissez-faire* was first used in an economic sense, though probably in a somewhat indefinite way, by a merchant in a conversation with King Louis XIV. Dr. de Gournay was the earliest regular economist to utter it, which he did with the additional "*et laissez passer*." For a long time the words "*faire*" and "*passer*" had in the minds of economists a very limited scope. They meant simply freedom of labour and of exchange and commerce, not all-round independence of government. They proposed to restrict government only from touching men's industrial life, where they considered the utmost liberty and competition ought to prevail. But is it possible sharply to separate our economic from our other life, repudiating governmental surveillance in the economic domain while admitting it elsewhere? The fact is, that the "economic man" is an abstraction. No one can possibly point out the boundary of the economic realm. Cases are hard to think of in which interference by law with conduct in any way would not involve meddling with some one's industrial pursuits.

Supposing the creation of wealth to be a substantive interest by itself, we find it no easier to regard the principle under consideration as an absolute one. All public works,—draining and lighting streets, securing fixity in the value of money, trustworthy national statistics, &c.,—are governmental enterprises. There are many industries in which individual interest is palpably and emphatically contrary to the amassing of general wealth—such as the destruction of forests, the taking of fish and game at wrong seasons, and the manufacture and sale of hurtful books and

pictures and of alcoholic drinks. The liquor traffic is an evil, economically as well as morally, preventive and destructive of wealth on a colossal scale; yet individuals find it too profitable to relinquish.

The entire uplift in the condition of the poor, such as it is, has come from the inworking upon the industrial world of forces, philanthropic and ethical, which the mere business relations of employers and *employés* never could have supplied. And to-day, far along as the working population has gone, were it again surrendered to its unaided resources, left to fight its own battle for wages on pure *laissez-faire* principles, destitute of countenance and aid from the public conscience, left without the help of philanthropic and religious ideals in the people at large touching the manner in which human lives ought to be lived, its advancement would cease, and a retrogression whose end none could foresee would set in.

Two other false assumptions belong to the same *laissez-faire* philosophy. 1. That men are quite sure to know their own economic interests, better, at least, than the public authority can. 2. That men certainly pursue their economic interests when they see them. The history of banking, of insurance, of railways, and of business enterprises in general, is full of illustrations of men's inability to see, or to follow, their true economic interest. While selfishness is not the perfectly trustworthy economic servant which *laissez-faire* enthusiasts allege, unselfishness has an economic office of which they do not dream. There are two great, generic forces which together explain a vast number of the phenomena which science has to study: one is gravity, the other the instinct of self-preservation. Economists have sought to explain by this instinct almost all the phenomena of the social world. But as in biology the masters are now forced to admit that the law of self-preservation does not solve all difficulties, so in the social world we find that we must take account of another force—that of altruism. Society as a whole has a life of its own, and a dynamic movement which constitute it an entity such as would hardly be suggested by a study of individuals separately. This social entity enables us to understand the altruistic impulse, and therewith the best part of man's ethical life.

No English economist of the first rank has ever maintained that a perfect *laissez-faire régime* would at the same time be perfectly just. It was reserved to Bastiat to maintain that the free pursuit by each human being of his own welfare as conceived by him, would result in the highest possible good of the community as a whole. False as this tenet is, nothing can be more interesting than the reasoning which led up to it. "We deny that the *laissez-faire* order is necessarily just or moral, as we have denied that it is best calculated to promote either the aggregation or the distribution of wealth. Industrial liberty has been, and still is, a mighty engine of good. The point is to work it, not to worship it; to take it, where we can, as an economic maxim, but not as imperative or sacred law, even in economics, still less in morals."

It is assumed that economic causes within man and outside, acting independently of society's reason and volition, would so distribute wealth if left to themselves, that the result ought to be for the best good of all, and so to accord with righteousness. But as this is not the actual outcome, most economists divide into two classes—those who wrest morals to suit their economics, and those who wrest economics to suit their morals. Surely in automatic and unregulated economic distribution no ethical principle need be looked for. Ungoverned, unguided, mechanical distribution will never issue in justice. All the economic happiness for which men long may not be obtainable by the agency of government, but the government may be efficiently used as a regulating and harmonizing factor in the economic sphere. The appro-

priate question is not, what is it *natural* for government to do? but what is it *rational* that it should do? To which the only sane answer is, that it should do, at any time and place, all that it is then and there for the true and permanent weal of society at large that it should do.

**TWO FACTS AS TO INERRANCY.** By Prof. E. J. WOLF, D.D., Gettysburg, Pa. (*The Lutheran Quarterly*).—The burning question of the hour in the theological world is the inerrancy of the Holy Scriptures. By some it is contended that Revelation itself must fall with the surrender of the theory that the *form* in which it originally came to us was in every particular faultless and infallible. On the other hand, the possibility of inerrable compositions has been boldly denied. Whatever comes through human hands, men tell us, must share the defects and the limitations of the human mind, and traces are to be found in the Scriptures which betray their authors' consciousness of the imperfection of their productions. Dr. Wolf simply offers some undeniable facts for consideration which, though familiar to Biblical students, are too often put in the background.

I. The Church is not in possession of the autograph manuscripts. The original documents are nowhere to be found; no eye of man has seen them for thousands of years. The controversy concerning *their* exemption from the possibility of error can have no practical value. Whatever Biblical criticism may be able to accomplish by way of restoring the original text, this science is yet in its infancy. The oldest Hebrew manuscripts existing date from the sixth to the twelfth centuries: the Greek Septuagint is twelve centuries older than the oldest extant Hebrew manuscript, and it was evidently made from a text that differed widely from the received Hebrew original. As the deviations from the original consist, not merely of faulty renderings, but of differences of matter, it is obvious that either the LXX. followed a corrupted text, or our present Hebrew is corrupted. Probably neither of them is strictly faithful to the original, the manuscript of the Pentateuch, for instance. The writings of the New Testament offer the same difficulties: the autographs may not have contained a single mistake, but they are not at our command. The nearest to the original are several Greek manuscripts copied during the age of Constantine, and some versions which in their present shape date from the same period. As the variations even in these oldest copies are considerable, some of them, at least, were presumably made from a corrupted text. None of the versions made after the first Christian centuries—the Gothic, the Anglo-Saxon, the Lutheran, the King James, or any other—rest upon anything better than defective transcripts of the original documents, at first, second, or third hand. The most that could be said at any time for the last 1600 years was, “Here is an imperfect copy of what the Holy Ghost witnessed to men.”

II. The Church does not need inerrant documents. They are not indispensable to the authority or to the efficient power of Divine truth. The loss of the original autographs, and the inevitable appearance of mistakes in the codex, did not detract one iota from the significance of the Holy Scriptures to the pious Jews, who, indeed, are chargeable with bibliolatry far more justly than any Christian. And Jesus cited as authoritative the Septuagint version of the Scripture, for which no scholar claims inerrancy; but this neither compromises His own character, nor weakens the claims of revelation as the power of God. The ancient creeds were not drawn from the autographs, nor were the early councils guided by them; yet some of their decisions have ever since been recognized as Divine truth. The Evangelical creeds of Protestantism cannot claim to be derived from the Scriptures as originally written. The story of the Cross, whether received by tradition or taken from the Scriptures as we

have them, has proved itself the mightiest force in human history. "Proceeding persistently and irresistibly on its mission, it is being translated into every language under heaven, each translation of necessity varying from all others—since it is impossible to express the same thought with precisely the same force in different tongues—each version having confessedly errors. Every issue of the Scriptures is a greater or lesser corruption of the original, yet who thinks of the Gospel suffering a material loss, or privation, or deterioration from this multiplication of mistakes? Who, but a critic, troubles himself about the differences which must inevitably obtain between all these editions and the original documents?"

There are variations of reading in the manuscripts, and they involve defects and errors, but none of them affect any really vital matter. Of what account, then, is the contention about the inerrancy of the *original* documents, when the documents that we have answer every purpose? Has the Church, with its defective text, either in knowledge, or in orthodoxy, or in spiritual power, fallen one step behind the body which was possessed of the inerrant autographs, if they were inerrant? Is there any theological system, or any evangelical doctrine, which, in order to support itself, is driven to appeal to the original documents, with the assurance that they would effectually settle every disputed point?

We have fallen into conceptions of the Word of God which are entirely too mechanical and too artificial. We forget the living and self-authenticating power of Divine truth. We talk as if it were impossible for God to put His word, His quick and omnipotent word, into an imperfect book. We speak of the authoritative character of revealed truth as though it were contingent on the vessel through which it is borne to us. God, in His wisdom, may have given to His people, in early ages, an absolutely inerrant book, but this His providence has failed to preserve. But whatever the translation a man may follow, he has an absolute guarantee for the soundness of his creed, the forgiveness of his sins, the correctness of his conduct, and the inheritance of eternal life. The Scriptures belong to the realm of truth. They open up their treasures to the believing heart; and he to whom they communicate their unspeakable blessings has little concern in the question whether it can be demonstrated that the original vessel could not possibly have had a flaw or blemish.

**THE KINGDOM OF GOD: THE CORRELATION OF THE WORLD'S RELIGIOUS CRAVING.** By **GEORGE PLATTENBURG** (*The New Christian Quarterly*).—One of the deepest and most universal intuitions of the human soul is the recognized need of a religion. Religion is a great fact of human history, an inalienable and irrepressible impulse in human life, everywhere present, everywhere indestructible, without which all of life's problems would be unsolvable enigmas. It is an inseparable factor in all the growth and aspirations of the race in all periods of its historical development. It enters as a necessary force into every stage of development, into every form of thought, into every polity, into every type of civilization known to the traditions or records of the race. A recent writer says, "Whether we descend to the lowest roots of our intellectual growth, or ascend to the loftiest heights of modern speculation, everywhere we find religion as a power that conquers, and conquers even those who think they have conquered it." The Kingdom of Heaven predicted and manifested in the Sacred Oracles, is the embodiment and the correlation of the religious instinct of the race. God meets the cravings of the human soul for deliverance from sin and death by conferring upon him a Divine empire, with its sublime facts and saving forces, and by it crowns his desires with gracious fruition.

The kingdom is Divine, both in its origin and its structure. It is no self-evolved organism out of man's religious instincts. God recognizes the inward cravings of the

heart, and meets and satisfies them with a complete and final revelation of objective truth in the Messianic kingdom : and the development of this kingdom sweeps the whole arc of human history. A King is promised, and the descriptions of His Person and reign exhaust the splendours and exuberance of Oriental fiction. The kingdom was foreshadowed by the history and fortunes of the Jewish commonwealth, outlined and typified by its religion and worship. The coming of the kingdom must, in the nature of the case, have been antedated by the coming, life, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, and session of Jesus at the right hand of the Majesty on high. The function of this kingdom is :—

1. The Proclamation of a Supernatural Message. Man cannot recover himself, and therefore God interposes with a directly-conferred message. Principles, as seed, antedate living organisms of whatever sort ; so the Messiah's kingdom is ushered in by the proclamation of the fundamental principles of moral and spiritual life and action. Jesus stands before the world first as the Divine Teacher of men, speaking with a self-conscious authority, whose calm dignity has no parallel in the whole range of human history. The significance of the fact that Jesus began as a Teacher cannot be over-estimated. In this is realized that the law of all true progress is truth, not force. As from a single protoplasmic germ are developed all the varied types of life now existing, or that have existed, so from the words of Christ the Messianic kingdom has its origin, nature, development, and destiny. And the *extension* of the kingdom is also related to the principles announced ; and it may further be urged that the principles determine the *nature* of Christ's kingdom. It is "not of this world." Worldly rule is grounded in force ; this is based on truth and love in the mind and heart. "This kingdom gives organic existence to a Divine message ; this message being a transcript of the ineffable perfections of God, becomes at once the basis and the ultimate standard of all moral and spiritual action."

2. The function of this kingdom is, to state a system of organic law. Laws are principles crystallized, and by them life is regulated. Man's relations are manifold and complex, and to know these is not enough ; they must be clearly defined and limited, and this is the function of law. A fundamental demand of Christ's legislation is the law of activity. The transaction of the Lord's business is an urgent call upon the individual life. Also in the legislation of Christ we have an adjustment of the relation of the citizens of the kingdom. The law of mercy of the new reign is limited by no condition, or tribe, or religion, extending its blessings even to an enemy.

3. Another function of this kingdom is to establish a system of rewards and punishments. The sanction of law is penalty. The existence of a moral order involves necessarily a day of reckoning and retribution. Jesus so states in His parable of Dives and Lazarus. The law of retribution is as much a law of our thought, as much a law of Christ's kingdom, as the law of love or mercy. The divorce of sin and retribution is unthinkable. Punishment is not arbitrary ; it is the organic product of a life of violated obligations and neglected duties.

The distinctive feature of both Judaism and Christianity, as regards other religions, is that they are based, not upon abstract truths or dogmas, but upon Persons. God is the personal centre of the one, Christ of the other. It is hard to impress upon the general mind the idea that religion is not a theory, or an ecclesiasticism, but faith in, and obedience to, an Infinite Person. Take out of Christianity Christ, His person, His character, or any one of the great facts of the Evangel, and you leave to the race only a religion of despair. This personal conception of religion meets one of the strongest tendencies of the soul, that seeks a Leader, rather than a philosophy.

What does this kingdom of God aim to do? There are certain questions of the soul that cannot be hushed, and will not be ignored. "Cries of the human heart and cravings of human nature after better and higher things; the earnest feeling after God; the restless striving to penetrate the vast problem of existence, whence he came, and what he is and ought to be, and whither he tends." The only solution of the great problems, adequate to satisfy the human heart, the Christ of God gives through His benignant reign. To solve these questions, to illuminate their darkness, to take away their fear and pain, came the Kingdom of Heaven. It is (1) a New Creation; (2) a New State; (3) a New Character; (4) a New Life on the Earth. It may be defined as that state in which the will of God and the will of man coincide. It must, therefore, declare the law and rights of citizenship, and the dignities and blessings therewith connected. How, then, is the right of citizenship obtained? The Master lays down as fundamental law that it is entered by a birth. The elements of the birth are invariable, and produced in harmony with an invariable law. God works here, as He works always, not by separated laws, isolated principles, or detached facts, but by systems. All life is the product of co-ordinated forces constituting an organic system. Apart from the definite laws of the Messianic kingdom the phenomena of spiritual life are impossible.

We have a kingdom which cannot be moved. The glory of all other empires fades and decays. Their civilizations die; their art lives only in the traditions of men, or in defaced and marred fragments. Not so Messiah's kingdom. It shall know no decay, no dissolution. Its conquests shall never cease; its dominion never end.

"The glory of all lands  
Flows into her; unbounded is her joy  
And endless her increase."

## CURRENT GERMAN THOUGHT.

**CHRISTIANITY AND THE INDIVIDUAL** (*Die christliche Welt*, June 15, 1893).—It is only in its form that the social question of to-day is new for the Church. In some form it has always been present. The new doctrine of the moral equality of men and the infinite value of the individual, taught by Christianity, was bound to create unrest in view of the glaring inequalities of society. The attitude of Christians toward the aspirations of the less privileged classes after a greater share in social advantages of every kind is determined by this doctrine.

That Christianity does assign such value to the individual is undeniable. The angels are said to rejoice over one sinner repenting. No privilege of position, birth, calling is recognized in God's kingdom. The teaching of Jesus is utterly free from exclusiveness of any kind. It is addressed to all—poor and rich, obscure and distinguished, women and men. His personal ministry, indeed, was limited to the Jewish nation, but His last commission included all nations. Paul was Christ's agent in applying this universalism in practice.

Now this idea was absolutely new to the world of antiquity. "That world, as we know it in Greece and Rome, valued the individual almost solely by his worth to the State. The State was the supreme interest. In the apotheosis of the Caesars the State

itself was deified. What the individual did to the State was the measure of his value. Whoever did little or nothing belonged to the second or third class of men. Hence the low position of woman, the little regard for the poor, wretched, crippled; hence the widespread cruel practice of exposing or killing weakly children, especially girls: hence, too, the institution of slavery. Because no advantage to the State was expected from prisoners of war, but the opposite, forced service was exacted from them. Women were only esteemed as bearers of children. And although natural sympathy was never quite absent, the sense of the duty of helping the poor and wretched did not as yet exist, because in consequence of their incapacity of serving the State their right to exist was denied." This explains the extraordinarily rapid extension of Christianity among the poor, the wretched and oppressed, and among women. They learned that, though of no value to earthly kingdoms, they were dear to God. They were set free from the ban under which they had lain for ages. They recovered their rights, and became citizens in a Divine kingdom. But this new truth, like all new truths, was only slowly carried out in practice. It was too great and too novel to be at once accepted. Hence even the Church was slow to carry out the Master's programme.

"It was natural that the Roman Church, as it extended over young, barbarous nations, should exercise over them a sort of guardian authority. It was forced to do this for purposes of training. And it has done much in this way. It trained the nations in many ways to settled habits, and taught them the arts of peace. But it gradually assumed this function of guardian. What should have been the means became the end. It strove more and more to keep the nations in a state of nonage so as easily to rule over them. From this effort arose the two divisions of the Roman Church, the upper priestly and the lower lay portion, the latter of which only belongs to the Church by its connection with the former. Thomas Aquinas borrows his picture of the future State from Aristotle, who knows only three classes in the State—soldiers, counsellors and priests, degrading peasants, artizans and labourers to slavery—an evidence how in the Roman Church the idea of the value of the individual had fallen into oblivion."

Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, by sweeping away all mediators between God and man, revived the first Christian idea of the value of the individual. The Protestant Church, like the Roman one, has not yet given full effect to the principle. All sorts of privileges have been set up and maintained, relics of the old heathenism. Witness the defence of slavery by Christian nations and writers.

In our days also, as formerly, the doctrine is flatly denied and ridiculed. A writer of our day, Friederich Nietzsche, "calls Christian morality a folly, knows no difference of good and evil, regards sympathy as weakness, and so denies the value of the individual. According to him egoism is the sole force active in all advance in civilization. Men are divided into two classes, servants and masters, the former of whom exist only for the good of the latter. Right belongs only to the might that is the agent of egoism. These ideas he defends in his writings with the fervour of a seer in brilliant, glowing style. This gets him followers; and the social confusions of the present supply fruitful soil for his ideas. There are only too many possessors who will know nothing of the claims of labour, and for whom their own interest is the only question. All these find in the ideas of Nietzsche a welcome justification of their reckless egoism and a solace for their conscience, when it would accuse them of wrong-doing. For according to these ideas they are quite right in asserting that the milk-cows are only for the minority, whilst others are only good enough to lead them out to pasture."

"In view of all such ideas and efforts it becomes the sacred duty of every Christian to put the infinite worth of the individual in the foreground, and to carry out its logical consequences in word and deed. It is quite certain that Christianity assigns such value to the individual in considering him in his relation to God. The Gospel knows only of the equality of men before God. And will the rich man, who gives his poor neighbour a share in the most costly possession he has, refuse him a share in the less? And could God, who has promised eternal life to all in Christ, make such a distinction in this life as Nietzsche does?" "Not that we advocate communistic equality. Individual ability and capacity will always be an effectual bar to dreams of this kind. But the doctrine of Christianity seems to us imperiously to require that every one shall receive a share in the social and spiritual blessings of his age in correspondence with his powers and his work." Nor is any sudden change to be expected. Revolutionary destruction of the old is against the Christian spirit. "We know that Paul sent the runaway slave Onesimus back to Philemon, certainly not without reminding the latter of the brotherly relation which is to obtain in the Christian community between master and servant. But it is no less contrary to the spirit of Christianity to halve Christian truths, confronting the world with one half and being silent on the other from opportunist motives. And certain as it is that Christianity has to triumph only by peaceful means, it is still our serious duty, as Christians, in our official relations and where we have to discharge our duties as citizens of the smaller or greater commonwealth—the State—to which we belong, no less than in our personal intercourse, to secure for the individual the recognition of his worth, and the rights following therefrom. This must be the first and foremost exercise of the love of our neighbour, so far as it relates to the improvement of his earthly relations. I must certainly, as far as I can, be the good Samaritan to all the oppressed and wronged, and still more is it the duty of every Christian to guard his fellow-man from violence."

"In emphasizing with such energy the value of man, Christianity by no means depreciates the community. Christ commands us to give Cæsar what is his. His promise of salvation is to the congregation or Church. He sends forth His disciples two and two. Men are adapted to society. Only in fellowship with other men do we learn to develop and use our powers. Such fellowship discovers to us our faults, and helps us to overcome them. But we are not for the sake of society. The community is for the individual. The communities of the family, nation, Church are essential. But their necessity depends on a higher one, namely, the necessity of conducting the individual, who enters life unformed, to the highest possible unfolding and use of his capacities—physical, mental, moral, religious—that he may become a child of God, fitted for every good work. Thus the good of the individual is the standard by which we must judge the healthiness of the State, the Church, the family. And it is no sacrilege to deprive the family of the education of children where it is unconscious of its duties to them, or to permit the State to abridge the rights of individuals when these cannot be exercised without others being wronged in their personality. The social question has been called a religious one. We accept this in the sense that the question is only brought nearer solution in proportion as the value of the individual, which Christianity preaches, attains recognition."

FAITH AND THEOLOGY. By Pfarrer TRAUB, Leonberg, Würtemberg (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1893, No. 3).—The position taken in this essay is one extensively advocated in Germany, and on this account is well worth notice. It involves considerable departure from old ways. The paper is written with remarkable clearness and precision.

The starting-point is the statement that theology is a matter of the Church. Schleiermacher's definition is to the effect that it is "a positive science, the parts of which are united into a whole by their relation to the Christian consciousness of God and the practical duty of guiding the Church thus implied." Luthardt puts the case more simply when he says that the test of theology is that one can take its statements to the bedside of the sick and dying and use them in instructing the ignorant, and confirming doubters in serious questions of conscience. The meaning, of course, is not that every theological proposition can be so used, but that theology as a whole should correspond in method and matter to the faith, which is both the basis of the Church's existence and the support of the individual Christian in life and death. Two questions have to be considered: 1. The Nature of Faith; 2. The Nature and Task of Theology.

1. How does faith arise? In what does it consist? Christ's words to Peter show that faith must be the effect of a Divine act in man. Outward means were not ignored. In Peter's case these means were personal intercourse with Christ, and the great confession was the result. There is no other way still. "By the preaching of the Gospel Jesus comes into our field of knowledge. He humbles us by His moral greatness, and first brings us to the sense of our lost, wretched condition. But He also lifts us up by His heart-winning love, and by showing us God's love in His own love He gains our confidence as the only one able to save. There is no other road to faith in Christianity. To the wealth of Divine ways and means no limit can be set. But they must all at last meet in one point, if Christian faith is to arise. They must secure the bringing home to a man of the Gospel of Jesus and its power over his heart." The origin of faith explains its nature. It is nothing else than hearty confidence, trust in Christ and the God revealed in Christ. In the Lutheran confessions faith and the promise of God are correlatives. The promise is simply God's gracious disposition revealed in Christ, and faith the trust that lays hold on God's grace. It is evident that this statement does not exhaust the contents of faith. "Only the immediate ground and the direct object of faith are fixed in it. On the other hand, in the complete contents of faith everything is included, which stands in necessary connection with confidence in God's revelation in Christ; and the task of theology is to unfold the thoughts involved in that initial experience."

This statement of the case is part and parcel of the teaching of the Reformation. "Even to the early Protestant orthodoxy *fiducia* is the core and crown of faith." But that orthodoxy goes on to say that the *fides specialis* presupposes *fides generalis*; and the latter again includes *notitia*, as knowledge of the contents of Scripture, and *assensus*, the full order being *notitia, assensus, fiducia*. Each succeeding element implies the preceding, but the preceding does not necessarily imply the following. I may know the articles of faith without regarding them as true, and I may regard them as true without making them an object of trust. Hollaz says: "Fides est intellectu ratione notitia et assensus, in voluntate ratione fiducia." Quenstedt: "Piores due (partes fidei) ad intellectum, tertia ad voluntatem pertinet."

Herr Traub contests the position of *assensus* in this statement of the order, holding the true order to be *notitia, fiducia, assensus*. The argument is that to make saving faith depend in any sense or degree on an intellectual act is to change its nature and destroy its certainty. Intellectual assent to articles of faith even on the authority of Scripture is a falling back to the standpoint of the Roman Church, Scripture being substituted as a formal authority for the Church. "To us Protestants it is a sin to hold anything as true in matters of faith which does not attest itself as true to our conscience by its import." Besides, how is this

assent, which is to precede faith, to come into existence? The doctrines which it accepts are not clear to the natural understanding. They can only, then, be accepted by want of thought or an act of will. Faith thus becomes an act of man instead of an act of God. And, again, this view changes the object of faith, which is not Christ, but something about Christ. On the contrary, Christ Himself is the only true object of faith. "To this object of faith *fiducia* corresponds as a direct correlative. I believe in Christ when Christ, by the revealed import of His person, wins my trust. To require assent as a condition has here no sense. . . . Certainly, an *assensus* is involved in *fiducia*. I shall hold as true all doctrines which Christian knowledge develops from the initial act of faith. But this holding true does not precede trust, but is a part of the trust itself."

It may be objected that faith in Christ implies assent of some kind. Christ lived centuries ago, and unless we have some sort of historical faith in Him, we cannot exercise trust. Herr Traub, however, rejects the suggestion. It would, he says, make saving faith depend on the result of intricate historical inquiries. True, nothing is to be feared from such inquiries. But as they are possible only to the few, the faith of Christians would practically be in the hands of these few. "Thus it is the freedom of faith which forbids us to make the certainty of faith depend on any historical conviction as a precedent condition. No doubt faith includes an historical conviction, for without the certainty that Jesus belongs to history Christian faith cannot exist. But this certainty does not precede faith, but grows out of and with it." The writer acknowledges *notitia* to be necessary beforehand, but denies this of *assensus*. He supports himself by the agreement of Professor E. Haupt. And yet with all respect it is difficult to understand how assent can be excluded any more than knowledge. There must surely be an antecedent historical certainty, which experience converts into religious certainty. "By the power which the Christ of the Gospels gains over the heart, He convinces men of the reality of His person. Whoever has felt this power knows that this figure of Christ is not a product of fancy, but historical fact. A conviction, so grounded, need not fear the result of historical criticism. For what is gained in the way of personal experience cannot be taken away again by the results of science. Perhaps the individual believer is unable to refute the objections raised because not versed in history. But this he knows, that any historical science must be wrong which would take from him the most certain of all realities."

2. What, next, is the right course of Theology? It is a science of *faith*, and it is a *science of faith*.

(1) It is a science of *faith*. "Its business is 'to formulate Christian truth in all its parts as truth of faith, so that faith, and only faith, which is *fiducia*, can appropriate them.' We have seen God's saving revelation in the historical person of Jesus to be the immediate ground and direct object of faith. Here is the point at which Christian theology has to strike in, and from which it has to sketch the system of Christian truth. The saving gift, disclosed in Christ and secured by Him, forms its starting-point and foundation. From this point of view it must obtain the doctrine of God, grasp the nature of sin, unfold the idea of the Church, the Word of God, the Sacrament, the meaning of eternal life. Therewith much which traditional dogmatics usually includes falls away. But what is lost in extent is abundantly compensated by the unity and compactness, as well as the practical usefulness, of the system of Christianity thus sketched."

The writer then tries four forms of theology by this test—the orthodox, speculative, experimental, and Biblical. The prolegomena of the old orthodox systems

consist in a natural doctrine of God, a rational doctrine of sin, and the conditions of redemption as determined by the nature of justice and sin. Only then does the account of the Person and work of Christ come in. "The objects of faith are described, not as they exist to the experience of faith, but as the intellect professes to understand them in their own nature. Then the subjective experience of faith comes into account. This order of treatment corresponds thoroughly to its conception of the nature of faith. If an intellectual acceptance of articles of faith forms the postulate of saving faith, it is only consistent for Christian truth, not to be sketched from the standpoint of experience, but to be set forth as intellectual truth in its objective connection. But if this conception of faith contradicts the evangelical view, this also holds good of the doctrinal system in harmony with it. *Criticism of the orthodox conception of faith is also criticism of the entire orthodox system of doctrine.* It cannot be denied that this criticism is the most serious that can be passed on the current Church theology. Were it merely said, this theology contradicts science, it might accept the reproach and simply affirm that science should bow to the obedience of faith. But the theology is quite otherwise affected by the allegation that it is out of harmony, not merely with science, but also with faith, whereas it claims to be in a special sense a theology of faith."

Speculative theology takes as its basis the Hegelian principle, that religious faith represents the form of presentation which is raised in philosophy to idea. Here faith suffers wrong: a system of ideas is imported into it belonging to another region altogether.

Experimental theology is that which builds on subjective experience as a complete, self-contained transaction. Divines like Frank are no doubt pointed to. Here, again, it is said, subjective experience is an empty abstraction apart from objective revelation. "Personal experience must form the starting-point of dogmatics, but not in isolation as a subjective transaction, but in its relation to objective revelation."

The fourth form of theology criticized is "Biblicism," represented by Beck and Kübel. This also is said not to correspond to the nature of saving faith. While drawing from Scripture a system of Divine teaching, it does not first determine the historical fact, "which forms the direct ground of faith, and from which alone the sketch of a complete view can be attempted." Its object of faith—a doctrinal system—corresponds more with faith as *assensus* than as *fiducia*: "For I can only trust in a person, not a system." "The nature of faith only admits such an exposition of doctrine as makes faith in the historical revelation in Christ the source and norm of Christian knowledge, and from this point judges all the several parts of the Christian system."

(2) Theology, again, is a *science of faith*. An objection is sometimes made that theology as a science must be dependent on worldly knowledge: it will improve as ordinary philosophy improves. But no such dependence is necessary. As matter of fact, theology has often been so dependent, but not from any inherent necessity. The freedom of faith secures the freedom of theology. It is true, also, that theology uses in its processes the formal laws of knowledge; but it only does this in the same way as other sciences, such as psychology, do. Its independence is secured by its subject-matter.

There are two points at which the independence of theology seems to be threatened by its character as a science. In proving the truth of Christianity it has to appeal to moral standards, and so may seem to be subject to the science of ethics. But it is no philosophical system of ethics that is appealed to, but only the general

ethical truth which is universally acknowledged. Again, the fact that theology assumes some theory of knowledge may seem to imply some sort of dependence. The fact is undoubted, but the inference is wrong. "The theory of knowledge, which theology needs, assumes the certainty of faith. Only from the objects of faith can the rule be sketched by which knowledge of those objects has to shape itself." "Theology starts from the facts of religious experience, analyses their conditions latent in the subject, and thus arrives at the subjective functions active in all religious knowledge." Theology needs a theory of general as well as of religious knowledge. If a scientist denies the being of God, the theologian has to prove him wrong by showing that he is overstepping his province. And he does this by distinguishing between the certainty of faith and that of science, and showing that faith and science are two different fields with different laws. The independence of faith, and so of theology, is thus amply shown.

The affinity of faith and theology is clearly evident. The differences between them are no less certain. "Faith is an act of God in man's heart. Theology is the explanation of this act with the instruments of human knowledge. Since, then, all human knowledge is liable to error, the Gospel, on which faith depends, is an unconditional authority, but not theology. This is always merely a relative authority, namely, so far as it gives expression to the Gospel. Now, it is certainly the duty of every theology to give the purest possible expression to the Gospel; and every conscientious theologian must be convinced that his system is the best and purest he can arrive at. Else he could not defend it. But it would be sin in him to bind any one else to it as an unconditional authority. The authority is not his system, but the Gospel which he desires to serve by his system. Certainly he cannot indicate *in concreto* where in his scheme the Gospel ceases and man's thoughts begin. Else he would have to strike out the latter. But *in abstracto* he must maintain the distinction, unless a theologian is to become a Pope. Hence also no theological system or dogma is essential to salvation."

The same number contains an article by Professor E. König, of Rostock, on "The Evidence of Language in Literary Criticism, especially of the Old Testament," and one by Professor J. Weiss, of Göttingen, on "Jewish Christianity in the Acts and the so-called Apostolic Council"; both are important, elaborate, and highly technical.

\* **PHILOSOPHICAL VOICES OF THE DAY ON CHRISTIANITY AND THE CHURCH.** VON HARTMANN and FRIEDRICH PAULSEN (*Die christl. Welt*, 1893, No. 14 and 26).—It cannot be denied that the philosopher of the Unconscious has shown himself in the course of time an accomplished critic in the most diverse fields. Once a military officer, then regarded by professed scholars as a fantastic dilettante, E. von Hartmann has won the reputation of an indefatigable, many-sided, deeply penetrating thinker, combining astonishing wealth of knowledge with great speculative talent. His long series of works, great and small, abundantly prove how he has striven to work his way out of superficial vagueness to depth and clearness. His labours in the field of ethics and the philosophy of religion have not been all of a merely destructive tendency.

In a recent essay Von Hartmann has expressed most disparaging opinions of the present state of the Protestant Church in Prussia. According to him, it is ruled by hierarchical tendencies; its trust is in ecclesiasticism, not truth; its leaders look with admiration and envy on the strict discipline and organization of Rome. While the conservative parties are Romish in spirit, the liberal divines are not even Christians. He classes Ritschlians with the former. The writer in the *Christliche Welt*

thinks there is a modicum of truth in this estimate. He himself accuses the reigning powers of the Church of greater anxiety for position than truth. "The warm breath of love is wanting, the free, strong impulse of true idealism; all earnest, decided thought is under a ban. If this spirit grows, there will follow as an unavoidable consequence, not indeed the dissolution of Christianity, but of a certainty the dissolution of the Prussian National Church."

But our business is with Hartmann's attitude to Christianity generally. This has not changed for the better since the publication of his pamphlet on the *Dissolution of Christianity* in 1874. In the last edition he says, "Jesus was a Jew from head to foot; he lived and died in the circle of ideas of his age and people, sharing the superstition of the former, and the hope of the latter. . . . Love in its deeper sense was first made the central point of ethics by John, and it is utterly unhistorical to read this position into the teaching of Jesus. Even in an ethical respect nothing distinctive remains of the teaching of Jesus that would be serviceable, and what is serviceable shrinks into occasional citations whose depth and bearing Jesus cannot be shown to have seen. . . . For the religion of the future more is to be gained from Buddhism than from Christianity." Our critic says well, "Such utterances do no honour to Hartmann's spirit of inquiry and justice; they testify of a bitterness against Christianity such as can only be explained by deep antagonism of inward disposition. The pessimistic spirit in Hartmann plainly revolts against the joyous spirit of the Gospel. The Christian faith is in reality born of the strong love of life, whilst the philosophy of the unconscious owes its origin to weariness of life." Here and there in his writings Hartmann surprises us by utterances which are more akin to Christian ideas, as Buddhism does. Thus in one place he says, "Only faith in Providence can give man security that in his moral conduct he is not sacrificing body and life to an empty fiction; only faith in Providence can lead humanity to trust without reserve in the divine leading of the universal process of good, and to co-operate with its unknown aim in the calm certainty that it means real good." But in Hartmann, as in Buddhism, single sayings cannot blind us to the ineradicable antagonism in essentials and on the whole. His Providence is different from the Christian. "Hartmann's Providence leads men gradually to see the utter futility of earthly existence; Christian doctrine on the other hand teaches us to regard the sorrows and joys of the present as the designed means for an eternal purpose."

From his standpoint of complete antagonism he holds that there is an impassable gulf between modern culture and Christianity in every form, that cultured ministers can only retain their position by unworthy compromises, that by the end of the present century every Church retaining the Christian name will be effete, that the Romeward tendencies of the Prussian Church open the way for "comprehensive schemes of reform, either on Christian ground or beyond the circle of Christian ideas." But Hartmann's conceptions of Christianity are so perverted that his judgments on such questions are worthless. "Wherever the possession of high culture is independent of the reception of certain metaphysical dogmas, wherever Christianity is something different from what it is to the philosopher of the unconscious, it will be evident that thoroughly Protestant and cultured preachers can discharge their office without unworthy compromises. Wherever, instead of Hartmann's caricature, the historical image of Jesus is apprehended by faith, the consciousness of agreement with all who from the heart acknowledge Jesus as Lord so predominates, that Church fellowship can be maintained with a good conscience despite many differences and antagonisms. Those standing outside (among whom Hartmann is reckoned) will

never be able to distinguish between principal and secondary, between kernel and shell; they will be readily inclined to magnify differences within the Church, and to suspect double-dealing when critical Protestants do not energetically assert their opposition to orthodoxy. On the other hand, one standing within religious fellowship, and inwardly possessed by its spirit, will be in a position to overlook secondary differences, because he has the feeling that he is one in essentials with the earnest-minded members of the Church.

Friedrich Paulsen as a writer on ethics is scarcely less influential than Hartmann, and is in much closer sympathy with religion and Christian faith. "Few philosophical works of the present day equal his in lucidity and brilliant expression." Many of his positions will raise serious objections. But his work on ethics is to be judged, not by its general philosophical principles, but by its detailed discussions. Whoever seeks in him a complete, harmonized system will be disappointed. But whoever seeks impulse and direction in the most diverse problems of the day will be amply satisfied.

In contrast with his colleague, Von Gizeycki, "a priest of morality without religion," he energetically asserts the necessity of religion in order to the healthy unfolding of man's inner life. He says, "Religion belongs to the normal functions of human nature; its absence is always a sign of disorder, either in the individual or the collective life." However scientific research may modify the conception of existence, there will always be room for the religious sense. Religion will never die out; it answers too closely to the inmost, deepest need of human feeling. In success, in order that we may not perish of pride and infatuation, we need the contemplation of something better, that we may say with joyous gratitude that success is not a merited reward, but a free gift; in the downfall of our hopes and plans we need the thought that earthly things are not of absolute worth; in the absolute uncertainty of all earthly things and the profound ignorance of our own future, in order not to fall a prey to helpless superstition, we need the confidence that, whatever may happen, it will turn to our good; it is certainly not chance that, wherever this faith fails, superstition grows." In his newest work, the *Introduction to Philosophy*, he acknowledges that only religions of a historical character possess vital force. "Religion only exists and only can exist in the form of concrete national religions, which have grown historically and are embodied in symbols and sacred acts. No abstract religion, such as is sought under the name of rational or natural religion, is possible; so far as anything of the kind is found in individual men, it is a survival, a last reflection of a full, concrete religion." "Whoever accepts the saying, Be ye not servants of men, may still to-day, undismayed by the mockery of the scornful and the hatred of guardians of confessional yokes, with the multitude of the true disciples of Christ in all ages, acknowledge himself a believer in God and His only Son. In the life and death of Jesus I get the sense of life, the sense of things in general; and that which makes life possible and shows its significance, this I call God and God's manifestation: so may the sincerest, truest, freest man say to-day as much as in any age."

Paulsen's conception of the morality of the New Testament is too narrow. To him its characteristic is renunciation of life, with its duties and joys. He contrasts it in this respect with the early Greek religion, whose aim was the self-conserving and self-unfolding of the natural man. Early Christianity, on the other hand, is characterized by "abstinence from the world, neglect of culture, devotion to the future life." "The fundamental sentiment of life is longing after the end of this bodily life." "In the Gospels, as we have them, the language of world-denial is heard oftener than the tone of joy in life." "The ground-tone in the life of Jesus

is set, not to victory and joy in life, but to death and conquest of the world." Not "the robust and triumphant, the hopeful and happy," but "hearts weary of the world and life" feel themselves drawn to Christ's Gospel.

It cannot be denied that the moral teaching of Jesus has a severe side. Not to confess this is to be unjust to facts. But, on the other hand, the contrast with Greek thought does not exhaust the truth. In such a contrast, the chief moral elements of the Gospel receive scant justice. "The obvious bases of the life and teaching of Jesus are scarcely referred to by Paulsen. In vain one seeks for any clear allusion to the two points on which the whole of Christian morality turns. Nothing is heard of the essential importance of faith in the heavenly Father, who turns everything to good; nothing of the infinite value ascribed to the individual soul. Had Paulsen started from these two points, he would have come to other conclusions. . . . Over against the Greek inclination to worship nature and culture, Christ maintains the specifically moral element. The ascetic strain in primitive Christian morality does not, as Paulsen's account suggests, form the essence of Christ's view of life; it is simply the form in which the truly moral judgment of all relations found energetic expression. The resolute tracing back of morality to its innermost essence, in conflict with hollow sham and selfish devotion to the world, quite naturally took an unworldly, ascetic stamp. Without a certain recklessness, the unfolding of moral life in the world is inconceivable. Man's highest duty, as Christ revealed it in all its majesty, demands unreserved subordination of all temporal gifts to the one supreme good. Where such a demand is refused obedience, nothing avails but, instead of making base compromises, to insist severely on the lofty rights of the moral world. Sentimental culture may not approve this; but every truly moral nature will sympathize with a spirit that is ready to put all outward glory second when the eternal weal of a single human soul is at stake. The primitive Christian feeling is not as strange as Paulsen thinks to modern Christians. We feel ourselves in touch, not merely with single aspects of Christ's view of life, but with its innermost kernel."

A similar judgment must be passed on Paulsen's judgment of the Reformation. Here also secondary features are touched on, while the essential is passed by. Paulsen complains that some Protestants will be satisfied with nothing but unqualified condemnation of Rome and praise of Luther. We require neither one nor the other; but we rightly ask so able and earnest a thinker as Paulsen to take notice of the chief features of Luther's life and work, and not pass them by. "When, after a cursory and inadequate account of the religious position of Luther, it is simply said that the Reformation 'promoted the release of the modern spirit from the supernaturalistic view of the world and life,' and contributed to the secularizing of modern times, this can scarcely be described as an adequate and just account. The main evangelical ideas, which are of such significance for ethics, are unjustly treated. The right of the individual personality to treat independently with God in the highest and holiest questions, the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers, the rejection of the monkish ideal of life in favour of the laws of nature and God—all these weighty aspects of the Reformation deserved to be taken into account in an historical survey of the development of moral theories. But Paulsen preferred, instead of considering the positive ideas, to put some secondary, negative phenomena in the foreground."

We regret these mistakes all the more as in many passages Paulsen shows such fine discernment. In the Introduction to Philosophy he says: "Faith by its very nature is the tenderest, freest, most inward expression of life. It dies when force,

fear of man, and policy come into play. This is the plainest of all the truths taught by the history of the Western nations, certainly a truth hard of belief to politicians. What can we do, then, to preserve religion to the people? Truly I know not, unless it be to take care first of preserving religion in yourselves." He has good hopes of the future, rejoicing at the appearance of a line of thought which distinguishes between dogma and doctrine. He says, "Following in Luther's steps, who in rejecting scholastic philosophy and theology rejected the false unity of faith and knowledge, the new school wishes to draw Protestant theology out of the intellectualism of orthodoxy, the passion for demonstration and system-making, in order to place the Church's life on the ground of redemption by faith and love." One thing clouds his hope: "The radicalism, absolutely hostile to religion, at present spreading among the masses of the people. The hostility excited a generation ago in the circle of the educated by government patronage of religion has now permeated the masses, who are in a ferment of political and social unrest." Still he holds fast his confidence. "Christianity, which has survived so many State convulsions, so many changes of culture, so many States and peoples, will also survive the storms which seem to aw' t the European nations. Yea, who knows, whether its release from association with the interests of the ruling classes may not be the condition of a new and vast development of its life?" We agree with him that Christianity is, not at the end, but at the beginning of its victorious course on earth.

## CURRENT DUTCH THOUGHT.

**THE APOLOGY OF ARISTIDES.** By Dr. W. C. VAN MANEN.—The principal contribution to the first number of the *Theologisch Tijdschrift* for 1893 is an exhaustive article on the Apology of Aristides, by the Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Leyden. The article embraces an account of the discovery and publication of the various manuscripts of the Apology—Armenian, Syriac, and Greek; a critical discussion on the different texts and versions; and a Dutch translation, on the basis of the Greek text, with notes and various readings. An account of this long-lost work having already appeared in *THE THINKER*,<sup>1</sup> it is unnecessary to do more than reproduce a few paragraphs from the concluding portion of Professor van Manen's article, in which he gives his estimate of its value for all who take an interest in the earliest history of Christianity.

Harnack, who dwells on this point in No. 13 of the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for 1891, does not reckon the Apology of great value in this respect; whereas he discovers afresh, and in a remarkable way, what he thought it possible to adduce from the Syriac text of the fourteenth chapter with regard to the relation of Aristides to the Jews. We cannot follow him in what concerns this particular point, because the Syriac text, as he recognizes himself, gives an entirely different view of the relation of Aristides to the Jews than does the Greek; whereas the latter is nevertheless undeniably the more original, and where it differs deserves, as a rule, to be preferred. The work of Aristides must be judged according to the Greek text, which, with a few exceptions, may be regarded as correct. The variations preserved in the Syriac and Armenian versions are valuable for our knowledge of a later Christianity—a Christianity, perhaps, in some respects a few decades, or it may be even two or three

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. pp. 266-67.

hundred years later—but not for the life and thought of the Christians of Aristides' own days. On the other hand, we learn from this writing not to despise details, which we may value all the more according as we are less convinced than Harnack is of the accuracy of his view of the history of the most ancient Christianity, and according as we are more assured than he is of the trustworthiness of the tradition which considers the *Apology* to have been written about the year 125.

There it stands, then, first of all as a noteworthy witness of the manner in which a cultivated Christian of those days, a born Greek, and in all probability a native of Athens, thought it proper and possible to defend the cause of Christianity. Its force lies in its attack upon the polytheism of the heathen, in contrast to which the belief in God, the Most High, the only One, and the Almighty, commanded itself, without further evidence, as reasonable and true, so that he did not feel the necessity of wasting many words over it.

Still, it would be a mistake if one were to think that for him Christianity resolved itself into the worship of one God. This is plainly enough seen where he holds reckoning with the Jews, and distinguishes them from the Christians, and combats their position in spite of the fact that they are worshippers of one Almighty God. It is true that they thereby stand closer to the truth; still, they do not advance it. The truth itself remains concealed from them because they have not accepted Christ the Son of God, and persevere in the denial of Him.

The Christians alone are in possession of the truth, because they do not stand still in the worship of God, as the Jews had known Him from of old, and as they still worship Him, although many of them frequently prove unfaithful; but because they permit themselves to be guided by what Christ the Son of God, the Most High, had made known to them concerning His being and commandments. In order to be a Christian, therefore, according to the view here involuntarily given, it was necessary to cherish a well-grounded conviction regarding the unity, the greatness, and the omnipotence of God, as well as regarding the work accomplished by the Son after His descent from heaven. It thus involved the holding of a doctrinal belief; but also, and not less, the serving of this God by unwavering fidelity to what were looked upon as His holy commandments. Indeed, the demands of the moral life established by Christianity are here placed prominently in the foreground, although not specifically, yet just on that account all the more noticeably. In chapter xv. Aristides has devoted a beautiful page to the description of the life of the Christians.

If for these reasons the *Apology* merits the attention of all who inquire with interest after the substance and form of the faith and life of the Christians of about the year 125—so far at any rate as these Christians existed outside of Palestine, and in particular in the refined Greco-Roman world—it is also of importance for the history of Christianity in général and of the New Testament canon in particular. As regards the latter, it settles the otherwise known, yet frequently controverted, fact that the Christians of that period did not yet possess a canon as such, neither in whole nor in part. When they speak of their *γραφαῖ*, anything may be thought of rather than a completed collection of gospels and epistles, let alone a collection such as we now possess in our New Testament. They had a book at their service whenever they wished to revive their knowledge of the Gospel history; but that book was not necessarily, and certainly not always, one of the later canonical Gospels. It may even be that there were things in it which before long would be cast out as heresy, notwithstanding that the work was still in use, was read and quoted by persons who for the moment and later enjoyed the esteem of every one, and who least of all would be suspected of heterodoxy.

Of special importance, both for the history of the canon and for the history of Christianity in general, is what the *Apology* teaches us as to the writer's relation to Paul. He does not name him, but passes him over in silence, and exclusively associates the work of the evangelization of the inhabited world, during the first period after the departure of Jesus from earth, with the labours of the first twelve Apostles whom Jesus had previously chosen. Still, he displays no enmity to Paul, but rather shows himself familiar with, and captivated by, his Epistles, especially with that to the Romans, although he quotes nothing from it directly. This is evident from his vocabulary, in which are to be found words, expressions, and idioms which are, if not exclusively, at any rate in a marked degree, Pauline.

Aristides is allied to Paul rather than to his opponents in his theology, in his Christology, in his soteriology, in so far as mention can be made of these. God is for him the Most High who has, for the first time, revealed Himself completely in Christ, so that the Jews, although they worship Him, do not rightly comprehend Him. He is the ground, the moving force, the creator and sustainer of all things; free from all human passions and failings; immortal, eternal; He has need of nothing, neither temple-service nor offerings. What He expects from His people is gratitude, and also fidelity to the commandments which concern the moral-religious life, without troubling themselves about the observance of dietetic regimen, circumcision, and the like.

To him Christ is not the Messiah who was promised to the Fathers, the man Jesus who later was elevated to the rank of the Son of God; but the Son from God, the Most High, descended from heaven, become man and appearing to men, not in order that He might found the Messiah kingdom, so long expected by Israel, but in the widest sense διὰ τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων. This deliverance does not consist in the breaking away from an outwardly oppressing yoke, but in the emancipation from error and sin, whereby so many are prevented from living in a right relation to God and their fellow-men. All who have learned to walk in the "way of the truth" through the preaching of the Gospel shall have a part in the coming salvation, as to which it appears to be impossible to form any purely sensual ideas.

Christianity is here, as it is with Paul, disconnected from Judaism and become a new religion.

Now, how is this relationship with Paul on the one side to be made to coincide with the suppression of his name, and the at least apparent disregard of his person on the other?

Assuredly not by explaining, with Harnack, that the Christianity proclaimed by Aristides is, even less than that of Clemens Romanus or Justin, based on the Pauline system, but that, on the contrary, it is based entirely on Hellenistic lines, "whose origin within the history of the Gospel we do not know from direct witnesses, but are able to reconstruct them without great difficulty." Because apart altogether from the question whether this last is indeed possible, the difficulty would only be pushed aside, and we would see ourselves face to face with the enigma how this Hellenistic Christianity, while displaying great affinity with Paul, could wholly overlook his person and work; and this even while his Epistles were read and there was every occasion to think gratefully of him who was the subordinate founder of the Gospel preached among the heathen.

How was it possible for Aristides, the born Greek, to neglect Paul, to whom he was spiritually allied, and to testify of the Twelve as he does, if it were not that he placed Paul, the founder of Christian communities in Greece, upon the same level with the Twelve; and, as a matter of course, looked upon him as belonging to that

circle which embraced all the early preachers of Christianity, namely, "the Twelve"? How was it possible for the same Aristides to read and make use of Epistles of Paul without committing himself to everything they contained, and without ever mentioning the name of the writer, unless it be that for him these Epistles were destitute of all that tends to canonical authority, and that it did not even occur to him to see in them the work of the "great Apostle of the Gentiles," who was supposed to have written them about three-quarters of a century before to certain individual communities?

We have here a phenomenon similar to that which meets us in the reading of the Revelation of John, the Preaching of Peter, Justin, and elsewhere—enigmatical relation to Paul, upon which the desired light is only thrown when we have learned to distinguish between Paul, the contemporary and spiritual kinsman of the first disciples of Jesus, and the younger Paul of Paulinism. And so for the future the Apology of Aristides may be named among the unsuspected testimonies to the accuracy of the results of the inquiry, conducted on the basis of this distinction, into the origin of the Pauline Epistles and the progress and development of the earliest Christianity.

**ELECTION.** By G. L. van Loon (*Bibliotheek van Moderne Theologie en Letterkunde*, 13<sup>de</sup> dl., 4<sup>de</sup> st.).—With regard to this article of faith there has been a long and bitter controversy in the Christian Church; and perhaps no doctrine has been less understood or more abused. The first Christians could not have derived this doctrinal idea of election from any external source. With them Christian feeling, religious experience, and sanctified living came first; and in their doctrinal ideas they translated into words their own spiritual life and Christian experience. The divines of a later age, on the other hand, explained their idea of Election, not from its origin in Christian gratitude for religious privileges which were denied to others, but from a theological system which had taken possession of their heads, and according to which the utterances of the New Testament were explained in a way that was never intended.

The starting-point of this theological system was the dogma of original sin and original guilt, which taught that through Adam's fall it had come about that all his descendants, even to the latest generation, had inherited an endless guilt and a natural incapacity to do any moral good. And men did not shrink from drawing the most startling consequences from this dogma. Every son of Adam was supposed to be incapacitated by the Fall from accomplishing any moral good; but, notwithstanding that, it was seen that a few pious people lived virtuous lives, and it was accordingly concluded that this must have been accomplished by an irresistible manifestation of spiritual power from God. And now speculation went a step further. What God does, He must have resolved from all eternity to do; for the Divine plan of the world existed before it was carried out. If, therefore, some men upon the earth were seen to undergo a change of character, and to repent, it was imagined that in the beginning God must have selected some from the entire mass of mankind—all of whom were subject to condemnation—and predestined them to repentance and salvation. On the other hand, it was believed that by leaving others in their lost estate, He must have predetermined them to everlasting condemnation. This is emphatically and plainly expressed by Calvin, who followed in the path already trod by Augustine, and completed and perfected his system. Calvin's teaching was in the main reproduced in the Confession of Faith of the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands, confirmed by the Synod of Dort, and reiterated in the five points against the Arminians.

It is to be regretted that an attempt should ever have been made to associate this doctrine with the words used by the earliest Christians to express their thanks for the religious privileges which they enjoyed above others. For it is this, and nothing more, that is contained in the texts quoted by Calvin and the Fathers of Dort to give an appearance of conformity to Scripture to this startling doctrine, which even Calvin himself described as "*decretum horribile*."

According to the Fathers of Dort, there are among Christians both elect and reprobate, whereas the New Testament Epistles expressly describe all Christians as elect. As the title "elect" is given to all Christians, without distinction, in the Epistles, it appears to be undeniable that the election, of which mention is made in the New Testament, must be something entirely different from that made use of by the Fathers of Dort, who divided Christians into the two classes above named. But not merely is the New Testament use of the word elect contrary to the use made of it in the Calvinistic doctrine, but this latter use of it runs counter to the whole spirit of the Epistles, which seek to stimulate our faith to lay hold of the living God, "Who is the Saviour of all men, specially of them that believe."

The case may be conveniently stated in the following propositions:—

I. In the opinion of the Fathers of Dort, in contradistinction to the elect, there are the reprobate. In the New Testament Epistles, in contradistinction to the elect, there are the men and the nations who are still without the salvation that is the portion of the elect, but who, later, will be participators of it. This is expressly stated in the Epistle to the Romans, where the question is put to Israel, who had hardened itself and for a while had remained opposed to the elect, "Did God cast off His people?" "Did they stumble that they might fall?" In the end the assurance is given: "A hardening in part hath befallen Israel, until the fulness of the Gentiles be come in, and so all Israel shall be saved."

II. In the opinion of the Fathers of Dort, the salvation to which the elect are chosen lies in eternity. From eternity God has placed some to the right hand, some to the left, and so has fixed their lot for eternity. But the election of which the New Testament Epistles speak concerns the methods of God's government of the world in time. It concerns God's predestination, God's predetermined disposition of mankind upon earth. God has chosen some, to what? To live under the blessings of Christianity, and thereby "to be holy and without blemish in love."

III. For the Fathers of Dort there is on the part of God an election, and this election, as was once pointedly observed, serves as a dam to stop the flow of God's grace. For those who do not belong to the elect there is, according to the teaching of Dort, no hope. But the election of which the New Testament Epistles speak serves as a channel for the further spread of the grace of God. Indeed, the elect are ordained to go forth and to bear fruit. The "holy people" is called to proclaim the virtues of Him who called them out of darkness into His marvellous light. Those who are chosen to live under the blessings of Christianity are so chosen according to the council of God who educates men by means of men, in order that they may carry the blessings which they enjoy to every Gentile and Jew who still lacks these privileges.

IV. The origin of election, as represented by the Fathers of Dort, lies solely in God's unfettered power. Yea, they do not shrink from tracing back the double decree of election and reprobation to the dualism of the Divine mercy and righteousness, and from these two attributes to deduce their dogma. At the same time they take care to keep them separate, so that one man should experience nothing of God's righteousness, and another nothing of God's mercy. They supposed that God has necessarily attached importance both to the revelation of His righteousness and of

His mercy ; hence the appointment of one portion of mankind to everlasting misery, and of the other portion to everlasting happiness. In the New Testament, on the contrary, election does not proceed from a secret decree according to which God foreordained mankind, His own handiwork, some to salvation, some to condemnation, and so presented the spectacle of the highest being failing to act as the most perfect. But the Epistles everywhere place the origin of election in God's fatherly disposition towards man, in the greatness of His favour, in the endurance of His mercy, so that it is impossible to speak of it without bursting forth into praise and thanks to God.

Would that men endeavoured by practical piety to make their calling and election sure, as an Apostle expresses it, and lay to heart the warning which Jesus once gave when He said that many are called but few are chosen. Jesus, who never lost Himself in speculation, is not referring to acts of God, but to conditions among men. Among the many who are called to Christianity, who, according to the phraseology of the New Testament Epistles, are chosen thereto by God, the elect, the specially chosen, are few. That is tantamount to saying that many are Christians in name, few in reality. If we, while glorying in the blessing of Christianity, do nothing to carry this blessing to others ; if the principle of Christianity does not ennable our heart and our character ; if in our conscience we must testify of ourselves that if we serve God at all, we do it all too little ; that we do it almost always with an unwilling mind ; that it is almost always the fear of punishment that influences us ; in that case the fatal sentence must come to us like a sword-thrust through the soul : Chosen are ye to Christianity, but to the elect, in the sense of the Master, ye do not belong.

## CURRENT SCANDINAVIAN THOUGHT.

ECCLESIASTICAL TRADITION AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM. By Pastor A. ANDERSEN (*Dansk Kirketidende*, 1893, No. 16).—There can be no doubt that one of the tendencies of the age is in the direction of putting science in the place of ecclesiastical tradition. But this cannot be done without involving transformations at many points which cannot be overlooked. One such transformation, which is very perceptible, is the alteration in the manner of regarding the sacred Scripture, and along with it, when closely examined, the transformation of Scripture itself. It is science that is now in the ascendant ; and to historical science, as generally cultivated in our days, belong two maxims, with respect to which there are good grounds for asking how far these rightly belong to history, and not rather to natural science. One of these has been frequently propounded, and under various forms, among others by Professor Hermann, of Marburg, one of the most zealous advocates of the new tendency. It starts from the notion that faith in the living God must stand in the closest relation to the acknowledgment of conformity to law in nature ; and the meaning of this is that a historical report that contains anything about miracles is, to say the least, a report open to suspicion. According to the second maxim, which has been largely followed in the science of comparative religion, whenever there are points of transition in the development of the race, connecting links between the old and the new must be sought for and pointed out, so that there may be no large knots on the thread of history.

These two maxims bring to the old difficulties as to the relations between Scripture and science a new and sharply-defined estrangement and inconsistency, which make the Scripture even more than ever opaque to science; and with opaqueness which cannot be made clear, science can have nothing to do. If the result of the old difficulties was that in this sphere science worked under restraint and with little real result, it now comes about that it works quite contrarily to what the Scripture narrates. The consequence is that Scripture has become a purely human book which contains much that is of little importance, much that is unintelligible, and numerous errors. Historical criticism, says Dr. Rade, has placed us in a free relation to Scripture. A clear idea may be formed of what is implied in this from a statement made in a work by Dr. E. Haupt, of Halle, published in 1891. It means that, although historical criticism should demonstrate the unreliability of every single feature in the books of the New Testament from the one end to the other, a Christian man will look on with the utmost unconcern. Yea, even if it should be shown that the accounts of the resurrection could not be correct, and that therefore they were doubtful in the highest degree, he would not be in the least disturbed. In this connection it may be remarked that a step further might even be taken—a step which Dr. Haupt does not take, but which has been taken by others and again retraced. Some years ago Professor Loman, of Amsterdam, believed that no such person as Jesus of Nazareth had ever lived. According to the new teaching, even although this should be proved to be true, it would not occasion a believing Christian any special difficulty, because—and this is the other side of the free position—all the same, throughout the Scripture as it lies before us, God speaks to the individual man, treats with him, makes him participator of His life. The Scripture is thus quite naturally God's Word, not because it is written by Apostles, but because God speaks to us through it. If you should say: Then the written word through which God speaks to me must also, in the form in which it lies before me, be a true word, the answer is ready—Who are you that you should prescribe to God what means He should employ to reach you?

So the Scripture contains the Word of God, because God uses it as a means for His intercourse with men; and according to its outward aspect, it is a purely human work, which historical criticism may deal with according to its laws in whatever way it can or will. This is the one transformation which takes place. The other is closely allied to it, and is equally, if not still more, comprehensive. It concerns the faith in both the meanings of that word—the belief itself, and the thing believed in.

Offence has been taken by those who have ranged themselves on the side of Professor Harnack in the present controversy on the Apostles' Creed, at the assertion that the real matter at issue is not the symbol, but the faith itself. And this is correct, however strange it may appear at first sight. It is the new interpretation of the faith that lies under and behind the battle. It cannot find its *raison d'être* in the Apostles' Creed. To assume this to be truth, and therefore to submit to it, is, according to Hermann, nothing else than the sure road to unbelief. If, therefore, the Apostles' Creed is to be retained, the new interpretation of faith must find a means of existence under the altered circumstances, but it would be best if the Creed were dropped altogether.

What, then, is the new interpretation of faith? It is somewhat difficult to give a clear answer to this question, for, notwithstanding the eloquent words and the glowing language used to describe the faith, it is not so easy to lay hold of a sober explanation of it. Faith is variously defined as a living experience, an overpowering

influence of God upon man, a consciousness of the beginning of new and heavenly forces in the mind ; it has its seat in that essential part of our being which forms its connecting link with God. All this might with some degree of accuracy be rendered accessible to our understanding by borrowing an illustration from ancient mysticism, and saying that faith in its essence is to be conceived of as something passive rather than as something active. It is the entering in of God into man's inner world, the world of mind ; little or nothing is said of man's entering into God's world.

What, now, is comprehended in this faith ? It is first of all the living experience that there is a God, and the feeling that there is a supernatural world. It is next the living experience that this God is gracious and merciful, pardoning the sinner, and raising him up to everlasting life. This living experience is reached through Jesus Christ. Even although the description which is given in the Scripture of Jesus of Nazareth is more or less incorrect and faulty, still God speaks through it to men ; through this medium He enters into union with the individual, and reveals Himself to be just such a one as is portrayed in the Scripture narratives.

Faith is a living experience, and thereby a certainty as to God and as to fellowship with Him. Every individual believing man can approach to greater and greater clearness in this faith, to richer and deeper apprehension of it ; he may expound it as has been done in the Scripture, and many times since ; but every one ought to be conscious that he may just as readily err in the apprehension of his faith as in his moral life. As none of us has any sort of Christian right to demand that our conception of that life shall be the standard for all others, just as little right has any one else to impose his view upon us. In this respect an Apostle is not different from other men ; indeed one may go a step further and ask, Is Jesus Christ Himself in this matter different from others ? There are deeper and less deep understandings, but is even the deepest understanding in possession of the truth ? As to this the Church does not possess any infallible writing, or any infallible teacher or system of instruction ; and just as little is there an infallible Confession of Faith. It is natural and reasonable that the individual and that the Church should give expression to their confession of faith ; but it is not natural and reasonable, it is at variance with true evangelical faith to seek to set it up as a model of what true faith is. Every one must have his own opinion, and the more cultivated the individual is the more readily must this right be conceded. That which is common to all is only the original root and kernel : certainty as to God and as to fellowship with Him in Jesus Christ.

That this conception of the faith is different from what has hitherto prevailed within the Lutheran Church is acknowledged by the men of the new tendency themselves. That it is also different from what is to be found in the New Testament writings need scarcely be pointed out. The new conception of faith has been formulated thus : In a historical fact there can be no faith, but only in a personality. If there is any meaning at all in this, it must be that faith can have regard to nothing that has happened at a certain specific time, but only to what exists at all times. Faith can only find a place in the permanent vital relation between God and man ; but there can be no faith in the conception of Jesus Christ by the Holy Ghost, there can be no faith in His resurrection. As occurrences in time these, together with all that pertains to them, come within the domain of history, and so under historical knowledge and criticism—not under faith.

Thus the faith and the Scripture are transformed, and much is transformed with them. It is quite certain that the motive power in all this has not been a new and large increase of Christian life ; but because science has been set up in the place of tradition. The consequence is that the faith has had to be transformed so as to

contain as little as possible of a positive nature, and thus avoid coming into conflict with science; and that the Scripture has had to be transformed into an indefinable something for which as yet a name has not been found.

**RELIGIOUS INSANITY.** By Rev. L. J. MOLTESEN (*Dansk Kirketidende*, 1893, No. 19).—When certain psychological phenomena are branded by experts in mental disease as religious insanity, the enemies of Christianity are sometimes not slow to lay hold of this as a convenient weapon. On the other hand, many Christians have shaken their heads and felt awfully shocked at the conduct of the medical experts. By neither of these parties has it been particularly observed that religiosity and Christianity are not one and the same thing—that one may be religious without being Christian. Religious emotion as such is no more Christian than the other emotions, and it is subject to the same conditions to which they are subject. If harmony is to arise in a man, the various emotions must be placed in accord with each other; if one of them is neglected or fails, the result is a weakness, and this weakness will influence the whole spiritual life; if one of them is overstrained, it will bring about a want of harmony that will disturb the whole. In either case, mental disease will undoubtedly result, especially if there are hereditary tendencies in that direction.

If religious emotion is held to be the noblest of all emotions, the most essential duty of every man is to secure its harmony as much as possible, and so to promote its well-being in every way. If one has learnt from experience that Jesus Christ is the source whence religious feeling has its wants supplied, and that in Him alone is this satiety to be found, he will listen as to a foolish tale when he hears it said that Christianity can make a man insane. If there is anything that Christ is more capable of doing than another, it is of healing the diseased mind. He could do that when He walked about here upon earth, and He can do it day by day even yet. Christ has always been and is still the greatest physician.

When in the history of the Church a great religious awakening has arisen, it has always been possible to point to examples of over-excitement and religious insanity, and not seldom have such conditions been taken as an evidence of special holiness, as in the case of heathen religions. These religiously over-excited men at these times become the most effective preachers; but in their ecstasy they preach themselves, and not Christ. The leaders of revival movements, as a rule, look more to religious rapture than to Christian wisdom in the choice of their preachers; but it is with these preachers (who are for the most part laymen) as it is with the so-called "wise" men and women. Some of these people have a natural delicacy, which enables them to see more clearly than the doctors and thereby to render help when the latter stand powerless; but, all the same, the State feels bound to prescribe a limit to their activity. In the same way, the Church must set bounds to the activity of lay-preachers—indeed, it is all the more necessary in this case, considering that there are much greater interests at stake. In order to preach, one must have, first and foremost, gone to the school of Christ, and in it the unlearned may advance as far as the learned; but over and above that there is required a knowledge of mankind, a psychological intelligence—now more than ever that human emotions have become so complex—and with these very few indeed are endowed by nature. In the case of by far the greatest number these are only reached by serious study. There are many clergymen who lack that discipline of the soul which is necessary in order to preach aright, but there are even more lay-preachers in whom the same discipline is wanting.

In connection with this subject, the results of an interesting investigation have recently been published by Pastor S. M. Hafström, who has had excellent oppor-

tunities of studying mental diseases, both practically and theoretically, and who has devoted special attention to those forms of them that had a religious colouring. His little book has received a hearty welcome from the medical profession, and it equally deserves the commendation of the clerical profession. It deals with a present-day topic with great ability, and is full of meaning from beginning to end.

Pastor Hafström shows, first of all, that what people are accustomed, almost as a matter of course, to call religious insanity does not arise from religious influences at all. If an insane person indulges much in religious phraseology many conclude that his disease must be of religious origin, thereby mistaking the cause for the effect. If a madman sings lively songs, no one thinks that it is the blame of the writer of them that he has lost his reason; but if he sings psalms, religion is immediately suspected. It is reasonable to expect that insanity should frequently take on a religious colouring, for religion plays an important part in many a man's life. But the connection is not to be treated otherwise than in the case of many characteristic forms of insanity now prevalent in which the thought hovers round ingenious mechanical discoveries, such as telephones, &c. Both Gentiles and Jews may give utterance to a certain exclamation when a feeling of pleasure or of annoyance overtakes them, without any conclusion as to their Christianity being drawn therefrom, and in the same way an insane person may make use of religious phrases in order to find vent for his pleasure or his pain. Pastor Hafström shows by examples that the younger physicians think that the number of those who lose their reason under the influence of religious troubles and scruples is in reality much smaller than is usually supposed; and he cites cases in which insanity manifests itself in a decidedly anti-religious aspect even among men who, when in health, are pious and resigned to the will of God.

All the same, Pastor Hafström observes that unhealthy religious influence may be the cause of insanity, or at any rate have a very real share in producing it; and he gives a table of statistics for the years 1878-92, showing the proportion of cases attributable to religious influences admitted during that period to one of the principal Danish asylums. The number amounts to only 5·04 per cent., and of these two-thirds of the cases were traced to the influence of the home mission. In twenty cases the exciting cause came from companions, relatives, &c.; in twelve from lay preachers; in ten from clergymen; in seven from missionary meetings; and in eleven from the home missions in general. These figures must, of course, be taken with caution, but they cannot be altogether overlooked. It is not so much in mental or spiritual excitement that the danger lies as in fear; and there can be no doubt that religious insanity is almost wholly attributable to those who work upon the emotions with the view of awakening fear or dread, and that for every one who loses his reason under such influence, there are hundreds who under the same influence fight shy of Christianity altogether. Although this influence is largely exercised by lay preachers connected with home mission work, Pastor Hafström points out that not a few of the clergy are often lacking in psychological insight. Among them *oratio* is seldom wanting, *meditatio*, often, *tentatio*, very frequently. In order to preach Christ successfully it is necessary to be in possession of inward faith accompanied with psychological insight and delicacy of feeling.

## THE BOOK CRITIC.

SOME LIGHTS OF SCIENCE ON THE FAITH. EIGHT LECTURES PREACHED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD IN THE YEAR 1892. By ALFRED BARRY, D.D., D.C.L., Canon of Windsor, late Primate of Australia. London: Longmans, Green & Co.

THIS volume forms the Bampton Lecture for the year 1892, and, as its title indicates, seeks to keep up the continuity of the series by bringing out some aspect of religious truth in such relations to current thought as will serve for a true Apologetic. As is well known, the series has furnished us with some of the most able and brilliant defences of the Christian faith. Although this volume may not be placed in the front rank with those of Mansel and Mozley, it will compare very favourably with many of its predecessors in respect to freshness of thought, comprehensiveness of view, and calm, judicial tone. The author is too well known to require any introduction to our readers. His reputation as a scholar and thinker precedes the publication of these lectures, and it will be well sustained by what is here presented. Making allowance for occasional redundancy of style, or rather parenthetic fulness, here and there—arising probably from consciousness of an audience in St. Mary's, Oxford, on the look-out for qualifications of statement—the writing is entirely suited to the subject in hand, and gives one the impression that the author is accustomed to weigh moral evidence and to recognize on all sides the congruities of truth. The title of the volume is suggestive of limitation, and awakens curiosity to know what department of science is referred to, and what particular rays of light are selected for rendering the faith more luminous. In some quarters it has been assumed that all science is light and all faith is darkness. Knowledge on the one side, and ignorance, *alias* superstition, on the other, have been pitted one against the other. Science and the Faith have been represented as incompatibles. The light shining from science is held to have revealed the unreasonableness of Theistic and Christian belief. But this period of strong assertion is now coming to an end. That which was to have exposed the weakness, the futility of faith is, now that the first feverish flush of excitement is past, taken up by the loyal hand of Religion and shown to reveal the congruity of the main conceptions of the believer in God and Providence and Christianity with the most assured acquisitions of science. Natural science, speaking the language of evolution, was once thought to be the irreconcileable enemy of our Faith: it is now, while speaking the same language, seen to be a friend and helper. It was appealed to to curse, and when the real testing came it could only bless.

Adopting the principle enunciated by St. Paul in the statement that "the Law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ," Dr. Barry holds that the scientific conception of Law, in its right place, will prove to be a *ταῦτα γαρ* to lead us to Christ, though not in the same way as the Law of which St. Paul spoke; that is, not "through its moral acknowledgments, but through its intellectual discoveries and conceptions." The view which is put forth and abundantly illustrated in these lectures is well expressed thus:—

"That while scientific idolatry of Law must supersede faith and virtually ignore the Christ, yet that the true recognition of Law in its true sphere does really thus lead up to faith in the Gospel of Christ, as the true and all-sufficient satisfaction of the maturest thought. I venture to urge the truth of St. Paul's bold contention, that such faith belongs to maturity of idea and character, and that the absolute rest on Law—so confidently set forth to us as

an advance towards the firm, sad grasp of ultimate truth, at the sacrifice of bright childish delusions and hopes—is really a going back instead of forward ; because it ignores that consciousness of a spiritual self, which is the sign of growth out of childhood to manhood, and that recognition in faith of an ultimate spiritual sovereignty, ruling not by compulsion but through freedom, which alone can harmonize with that inner consciousness" (p. 11).

In what way the scientific conception of Law is performing the part of a school-master to educate us to faith in a living God and a faith in Him as revealed in the true Son of Man, is then ably pointed out. It is shown to lead up to the necessity of some faith in God, as surely as the Law of Mosaic origin led up to the necessity of a faith in Christ as the *raison d'être* of its own existence. It is also pointed out how the method of science finds a real analogy with the method of Christian faith, and, when properly appreciated, prepares us for the processes by which we are led to the matter and form of faith we now hold. Not only so, but science, as now established, leads up to some very important points in the very substance of our faith. It is with this bearing of modern science on faith that these lectures are chiefly concerned.

It is interesting to note the skill and admirable judgment with which Dr. Barry makes the scientific doctrine of heredity bear on the Biblical doctrine of the transmission of sin. From the time of the Pelagian controversy there has grown up, largely through the influence of Augustine and Calvin, a view of "original sin" which while embracing a real truth of nature and revelation, yet lays a heavy burden on the Christian conscience. Whatever has come to his descendants through the sin of Adam, it is not "guilt." There is no true conception of what the term implies if it be said that we share or inherit his "guilt." Sin, as an undeveloped tendency of the nature to evil, is not identical with sin as the definite act of an individual personality. The Pauline view of the organic unity of the race may be a condition of the creation of guilt by the free action of the individual moral being, but it is in no other way related to it. If the bias toward evil is a most serious disadvantage from the Adamic side, the abounding grace in the Second Adam for all men is a counterbalancing advantage, which must be considered when the difficulties of the position are pressing. Science has rendered immense service to Christian theology in showing so abundantly that as the ancestor so is the descendant. "Original sin," in the Pauline sense, is heredity in theology. No one claiming to be scientific ought to take exception to it on that account. On the other hand, the scientific doctrine, applying as it does to all organisms, is a true *παιδαγωγός* preparing the cultured mind to accept the same substantial truth in the highest department of human life. Nor does this apply only to the sadder side of our moral life. As our author points out, it holds good for those elements of our moral nature which possess moral worth. Heredity is comprehensive of our entire being. And here comes in the interesting problem as to the extent to which, in the course of ages, the more perfect culture of the good will tend to weaken or overbear the force of the hereditary taint. Nor is this a mere question of the play of purely human forces—the struggle of the good and the bad Adam within us left to itself unaided. Science recognizes the action of new environments, and the appearance now and then in the sphere of evolution of new forces, or increments to existing forces. The action of the Second Adam is an increment to the previously existing forces in and around human nature. The Christian mediation is, so to speak, the introduction of a new element analogous to the introduction of life into the inorganic cosmos and of consciousness into the organic. In each case there is the setting up of a fresh force or set of forces which, after their introduction, work in with pre-existing forces on evolutionary principles. The "grain of mustard seed

is to evolve. The grace of the Kingdom of Heaven is to work its way and tend to create qualities that will qualify the hereditary transmission from father to son. There is doubtless a difference when we compare spiritual heredity with the determinism of nature, but the difference does not destroy the analogy in the main.

The foregoing may suffice to show the scope of this excellent work. Our space forbids any detail on the subject of Natural and Supernatural Evolution, Christ and all Creation, and Christ and Human Society. On these subjects there is compressed within three of the lectures a treasure of sober thinking and wise, far-seeing observation. Some of the most important of our modern controversies are here set forth in the clear, cool light of an impartial judicial mind. The latter part of the volume is devoted to a consideration of Criticism and the Supernatural, Criticism and Holy Scripture, and Truth in Revelation. Here, as in the earlier part, the scientific spirit and method and results are boldly accepted as bearing legitimately on the fact, the form, and vehicle of Revelation; and, so far as they are true in themselves, it is shown that, instead of weakening our faith, they tend to a faith that is more and more unassailable. Our author distinguishes rightly between the extravagant naturalism of Kuenen and the criticism which proceeds on an acceptance of ALL the data, and especially the clear historic *doctrine* of a Supernatural Christ, which is the true key to much in the Old Testament record that otherwise is unaccountable. Evolution is true in full measure of the Hebrew national life in its political, social, and religious aspects, but Christ is not the outcome of such evolution. He is the supernatural element introduced into the ordered process of the universe by which the earlier introductions of life and consciousness will evolve into a higher form than was otherwise possible. Again may it be said that Dr. Barry has produced a work that deserves careful study by the doubter and the believer alike. Its calm faith, broad sympathies, and sober reasonableness cannot but bless the attentive reader.

CHARLES CHAPMAN, M.A., LL.D.

DR. HERMANN SCHULTZ'S OLD TESTAMENT THEOLOGY. Translated from the fourth German edition by Professor PATERSON, Edinburgh. 2 vols. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh.

THE name of Dr. Schultz of Göttingen is one of the most considerable among those of living German theologians. For more than twenty-five years his works have been regarded by theological readers as deserving their best attention. His earliest, *Die Voraussetzungen der Christlichen Lehre von der Unsterblichkeit* (1861), was an ingenious and learned essay touching one of the most recondite questions in his own proper department, viz., the belief in a future life held by Old Testament writers. The first edition of his main work, *Old Testament Theology*, appeared shortly after (1869). More recently (1886) came his treatise on our Lord's Divinity, *Die Gottheit Christi*, and now we have the latest fruit of his labours in the fourth edition of the work, by which he will continue to be best known, put into the hands of the English-reading public. We agree with all that has been justly said in the many notices that have already appeared in theological journals as to the superior excellence of Professor Paterson's rendering of a book in itself so masterly and so absolutely deserving of translation. These are not mere words of course. Few living German theological writers handle their own language in a way so brilliant and so entirely free from the characteristic defects of Germanism as Professor Schultz. And this book is translated; in fact, it is transplanted. It can be read from beginning to end with as absolute certainty of the meaning, and with as much ease and enjoyment, as if it had been thought as well as written in English. But it is time to make some attempt to

put readers in possession of the author's leading views, and to weigh the results he arrives at on his important theme.

The author's theological standpoint has not been invariable through the whole course of his literary activity. There appeared little reason in his earliest work for ranking him elsewhere than with that "modern" treatment of Christianity which finds its best-known German exponents in the late Dr. Lipsius and the living Dr. Otto Pfleiderer. A much warmer and more definitely believing tone characterizes all his later work. We shall probably not be wrong in tracing some of this effect to the influence of his great colleague in Göttingen, Dr. Albert Ritschl. For the last ten or twelve years certainly, Dr. Schultz has been reckoned as of the school or "direction" which bears Ritschl's name. His critical standpoint has also changed with the rapid fluctuations in Continental Old Testament criticism. The determination to be up to date on these points has had a curiously disturbing effect on the successive editions of the original work. Again and again the book was altered so seriously as, in form at least, to be scarcely recognizable for the same. In this latest edition Dr. Schultz commits himself to the most recent critical positions—those of Wellhausen and his school—with a sanguine confidence which it would be hard to justify from his own previous experience. But he now delivers himself as a theologian from the vicissitudes of criticism, in a measure, by adopting the very sensible arrangement of separating the whole of the matter into two divisions. The first of these deals with Israel's religious history through its whole extent from the prehistoric down to the Asmonean age. The second discusses, in theological order, the contents of Israel's entire religious consciousness, or the doctrinal results. These two divisions correspond to the first and second volumes of the work as translated. The first, which is really the most fresh and helpful, is thus rather a history of the religion of the Old Testament than an account of its theology. Yet here the point of view is distinctively believing. True to the principle announced in his title-page, our author treats the whole as the "pre-Christian stage of revealed religion." It is not to him the mere religion of the Hebrews. He takes his ground in firm opposition to the dictum of Renan and other rationalists who would account for the monotheism and for every other spiritual characteristic of the Old Testament as simply the outcome of the national religious genius of that people.

"The Old Testament religion, like the Christian, did not come forth out of humanity, according to the mere law of natural spiritual development, but as a result of the working upon Israel's spiritual life of that Divine, self-communicating Spirit which aims at establishing the kingdom of God among men. . . . This religion rightly regards itself as called into existence by God . . . by the clear separation of this one people from the life of the other peoples of the world. . . . Indeed, the natural life of Israel, where it follows its own promptings, comes constantly into conflict with the religion of the Old Testament. Hence it can be explained only by revelation, i.e., by the fact that God raised up for this people, men . . . who possessed religious truth not as a result of human wisdom and intellectual labour, but as a power pressing upon the soul with irresistible might."

This is in a true sense a doctrine both of Revelation and of Inspiration. It need hardly be said that it includes also a thoroughly worthy conception of the continuity of Revelation proper throughout the Old and the New Testaments both. The cognate theme of the authoritative character of Scripture as the record of Revelation is not formally treated in this book. Dr. Schultz has said a good deal on this topic in other writings of his, *e.g.*, in a brochure of 1890, on "The Evangelical Theology in its relation to Science and Piety." We must take leave to doubt the entire consistency of his positions there, with his firm ground announced here as to Revelation, in the special sense understood in the Evangelical Church. Still more

difficult to reconcile with this fundamental assertion is the large place which he assigns to myth and legend in the Book of Genesis, also his doubt how far the name and life of Abraham are to be regarded as historical. "It goes sorely against the grain" with him, he says, "to give up"—and yet he does give up—"the Mosaic authorship even of the Decalogue." "Nothing in the Psalter, with the exception perhaps of Ps. XVIII., can be attributed to David." It is to be regretted that a work so masterly in its treatment of the revealed character and spiritual elements of the Old Testament religion should be still so entirely under the spell of the Kuenen-Wellhausen redaction of the sources. The vicious circle of that school of criticism constantly recurs. "Such and such writings cannot in any measure proceed from the pen of Moses or of David, because the sentiments contained in them cannot have been so early in the possession of Israel." So far criticism. Then, when the sources have been thus disarranged and redacted, "the course of religious thought must have proceeded in such and such an order, because our reconstruction of the historical sources demands this order." When the common sense of Biblical scholars shall have emerged from this temporary eclipse of reason, much of the critical value of works even like this must pass away.

Meanwhile, it may be safely said that we have no book on Old Testament theology which can be named beside this of Dr. Schultz for completeness, clearness, and accurate presentation (on the grounds of modern scholarship) of the contents of the older revelation, along with a reverent and cordial acceptance of these contents as the very truth of God.

J. LAIDLAW, D.D.

SMITH'S DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE. Second Edition, Vol. I., Parts I. and II. John Murray, 1893.

MR. MURRAY has rendered valuable service to students of Christian history and antiquities by his admirable series of Dictionaries, the earliest of which, the well-known *Dictionary of the Bible*, was published in 1863. Since that time, many new facts bearing upon Biblical Science have come to light, and during no period of equal length has the study of Holy Scripture been prosecuted in this country with more zeal, learning, or candour. It is not surprising, therefore, that it has been found desirable to issue a new edition of this important work, in which the history of recent discoveries should find a place, and the progress of criticism during the last quarter of a century should be recorded. So large have been the additions to the former edition that the new first volume exceeds the old by more than 550 pages, and it is therefore issued in two parts. "The second and third volumes," write the editors, "having been composed on a more extended and comprehensive scale than the earlier part of the Dictionary, do not call for similar revision; and there is, therefore, no present intention of bringing out a new edition of them." Here we cannot refrain from adding (though it is ungracious to look a gift horse in the mouth) that we are very sorry to hear it. As things are at present, we have the subjects from A—J treated in a critical and ample manner by the best scholars of the day, while the remaining articles were composed for the needs and with the information of thirty years ago. The articles on the three Synoptic Gospels seem to need revision quite as much as did the article on St. John; we should all be glad to have an article from Sir Charles Wilson on "Palestine," comparable with his great memoir on "Jerusalem"; the articles, "Messiah," "Son of Man," "Son of God," "Philippians," "Pentateuch," "Revelation of St. John," "Timothy," "Titus," not to mention others, would bear re-writing with advantage. And we say this, not because we wish to find fault or to undervalue this great Dictionary, but because we value it so much

and use it so constantly that we should be sorry to see it left in an incomplete state.

When one has to review a book of this magnitude, the difficulty (one difficulty, at least) is to know where to begin. There is so much that calls for notice, and all the new matter is so interesting, that it is hard to make a selection. Generally speaking, we believe that it is in the articles on the books of the Old Testament that the most striking changes have been made. Dr. Driver writes on "Genesis," "Exodus," "Deuteronomy," "Joshua," with that fulness of detail, clearness of style, and sobriety of judgment which he has taught us to expect from him. That it should have been found necessary to substitute a fresh statement of the problems of the Hexateuch for the admirable discussion given by Bishop Perowne in some of the corresponding articles in the old edition, affords in itself a remarkable indication of the mind of the English public on the subject of Old Testament criticism. The first volume of the *Speaker's Commentary* comes in for severe handling in one or two caustic notes (see pp. 1024, 1152); and, on the whole, the account given of the various books of the Old Testament is such as would have been very unacceptable to the readers for whom the former edition was written. Changes, of course, in public opinion there must be in thirty years; but the remarkable point here is that doctrines which many even yet brand as heretical and destructive of true religion, such as the late date of Deuteronomy, are set down in one of the most widely-read standard theological dictionaries of the day. The publication of these articles in *Smith's Dictionary* marks, we believe, an epoch in the history of English criticism. For facts as to the Old Testament literature that up to this were only known to professed scholars, and hypotheses which up to this were often quietly dismissed as "German theories," will in future, for good or for evil, be accessible to all, and are now introduced to the public in the best of company. Other articles, besides those by Dr. Driver, deserve attention in this section. Those by Dr. Kirkpatrick on "Habakkuk," "Haggai," and "Hosea," and by Mr. Margoliouth on "Job," seem especially good; though we do not presume to criticize in this department. We must be content to record what has been done, without expressing any opinion on the many statements advanced. We notice one article of a more "conservative" tendency than any of those we have mentioned, a very full and able notice of the Book of Isaiah by Dr. C. H. H. Wright. In this the unity of authorship of the whole book is pleaded with skill and power, though the argument may not carry complete conviction. Dr. Lumby writes on the "Bible" generally; his article, and one by Professor Ryle on the "Apocrypha," which is really a treatise in itself, are both written for the new edition.

When we come to the New Testament, two of the most important new contributions seem to be Bishop Lightfoot's on the "Acts" and Dr. Salmon's on "Galatians." The article on the Acts is a masterpiece, but one feels regret that the Bishop did not express a more definite opinion on some vexed questions. For instance, little is said about the date of the book. St. Luke, probably, had not seen St. Paul's letters when he wrote it, but yet, as it is subsequent to the Gospel, and as the Gospel may not have been written until after the destruction of Jerusalem (p. 40), the date of the Acts can hardly be as early as many writers have supposed. The reader who turns from Bishop Lightfoot's article on "Acts" to Archbishop Thomson's article in the old edition on the "Gospel of Luke," will find that the inconvenience (of which mention was made at the beginning of this notice) which results from leaving part of a large work like this unrevised, is very serious. There is a complete divergence of opinion not only as to the date of St. Luke's

Gospel, but as to the date and the structure of the Acts. For the Archbishop argues (and he has been followed in this by many) that the abrupt conclusion of the Acts is to be explained by the fact that St. Luke, when he published the book, had no more to tell, for no more had happened; and he hence argues that the Acts was completed about 68 A.D. Bishop Lightfoot, on the other hand, holds that the Acts is really a complete and finished work, that its plan is strictly analogous to the plan of St. Luke's Gospel, and that therefore as its ending is not abrupt, but artistic, no argument as to early date can be based thereon. For further details we must refer to the article itself.

Reading Dr. Salmon's article on "Galatians," with Professor Ramsay's new book still fresh in our mind, we naturally turn to what he has to say about the situation of the Churches of Galatia. And it is interesting to find that Dr. Salmon came independently to a conclusion not far removed from that made, as it seems, certain by Professor Ramsay's researches—viz., that the Churches founded by St. Paul on his first missionary journey, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra, are the Churches addressed in the Epistle to the Galatians. This view was held by Renan and others, though rejected by Bishop Lightfoot; but Dr. Salmon, in the article under our notice, approaches it very nearly. He holds that Iconium and the rest "might in a sense be described as Churches of Galatia," and he adds, "we find ourselves unable to assert with any confidence that St. Paul was ever in *Galatia proper*," i.e., the northern part of the country. Bishop Westcott's article on "Hebrews," and Archdeacon Watkins' on the "Gospel of John," are both of the highest value; but the commentary of the former, and the recently published *Bampton Lectures* of the latter, to a certain extent render these contributions less novel than some others. Dr. Plummer writes on 1 and 2 Corinthians and on the Epistle of St. Jude, and Dr. Sanday on Colossians. We notice that the late Dean Alford's articles on the proper names which occur in the Acts have all had to make way for fresh notes by Canon E. R. Bernard, of Salisbury. A supplement by Dr. Sanday on the recent history of criticism is appended to Archbishop Thomson's article on "Gospels," which, as the editors truly say, has a historical interest of its own, justifying its retention. We cannot, however, feel the same about the article "Jesus Christ," by the same writer, and think it a pity that it was not entrusted to some new hand. The old article has done good service in its day, but there is little in it specially worth preserving, nor does it take any account, of course, of recent investigations. But to return to Dr. Sanday's supplement to "Gospels," which is one of the most careful additions in the new publication. We do not know where else the English student could find, within anything like the same compass, so full and trustworthy an account of the criticism of the Synoptists. It would be impertinent and impossible to review a memoir like this in a few lines, and we do not attempt it. We call special attention, however, to the ingenious argument based on the varying *order* of the Gospels as they appear in the older Versions; and to the "Comparative Table, showing the analysis of the First Three Gospels under different forms of the documentary hypothesis."

The knowledge we have of Palestine, its plants, its animals, its people, its cities, has been so largely added to by the labours of the Palestine Exploration Fund since the first edition of the Dictionary was issued that we expect to find numerous additions and improvements in this department. And we are not disappointed. Canon Tristram, said to be the best English authority on the Flora of Palestine, has contributed the articles on Botany and Natural History. And the geographical articles have all undergone the most thorough revision, as any one

may see who will compare the new edition with the old. Some of them are by Major Conder, *e.g.*, "Gennesaret," "Judea," "Hittites" (in which ethnological and linguistic questions are also discussed). Those on "Goshen," "Egypt," and "The Exodus" are by the distinguished Swiss Egyptologist, E. Naville; but the lion's share of the work seems to have fallen to Sir Charles W. Wilson, the Director of the Palestine Exploration Fund. The geographical articles in the old edition have all been revised by him, and many have been re-written. The most elaborate and important of his articles is that on the topography of Jerusalem, which has rather a special interest just now, on account of the revival of the controversy as to the true site of the Holy Sepulchre. The article in the first edition of the Dictionary by Mr. James Ferguson was marred by its special pleading in defence of the peculiar theory of its author, that the "Dome of the Rock" was the Church of the Resurrection, a theory which never met with much favour; and consequently an impartial statement of the case from perhaps the greatest living authority on the question is all the more acceptable. The results of recent excavation are utilized, as well as the witness of the early Latin pilgrims to the state of the buildings in Jerusalem in their day. This last source of evidence is only beginning to be studied in England, and that mainly through the exertions of the "Palestine Pilgrims' Text Society"; but it cannot be safely neglected by any future writer on these subjects.

Another specially valuable article by the same writer is that on "Jordan." Here, too, much that is interesting is made accessible to the reading public for the first time. A remarkable circumstance is recorded on p. 1787, on the authority of M. Clermont-Ganneau, in reference to the stoppage of the waters of Jordan when the Israelites crossed into the Promised Land. "In A.D. 1257, whilst the bridge *Jisr Dámieh* was being repaired, a somewhat similar stoppage of the waters of the Jordan is said to have occurred. Upon this occasion, a landslip, in the narrow part of the valley, some miles above *Jisr Dámieh* (Adam), dammed up the Jordan for several hours, and the bed of the river below was left dry by the running off of the water to the Dead Sea." This opens up large questions, which we cannot discuss here.

One of the most interesting articles we have noticed is that by Dr. G. Ebers on "Joseph." In this a fascinating account is given of life in Egypt in the time of Joseph, which Dr. Ebers' vast stores of knowledge of that country enable him to portray with picturesqueness as well as fidelity. Mr. Pinches contributes learned and full articles on "Assyria," "Babylon," and kindred subjects. The illustrations with which his discussions are enriched are more numerous and better than those in the first edition. Dr. Sayce writes on "Baal," "Chedorlaomer," &c., and Dr. Schiller-Szinessy's aid has been called in to elucidate the musical notes in the Psalter. Another new article is that by Mr. Warwick Elwin on "Confirmation." Mr. Elwin's discussion is an indication of the increasing interest in the important subject with which it deals, an interest which has been stirred in recent years by the publication of such books as Dr. Mason's *Relation of Confirmation to Baptism*.

On the whole, it will appear that no pains have been spared to secure the writers most conversant with the topics treated, and the result is that the first volume of the Dictionary is far in advance of the remaining two. It remains to say a word about the editorial work proper.

Sir William Smith has availed himself of the assistance of Rev. J. M. Fuller as assistant-editor, and a large amount of work has evidently fallen to his share. He has added his name to the greater number of the short articles, and has thus made himself directly responsible for them; and has also contributed notes and additions to some longer contributions, *e.g.*, Bishop Westcott's on "Daniel." He has also

inserted a useful set of short notes on commonly misunderstood words and phrases in the Authorised Version, *e.g.*, *eschew*, *infidel*, *by and bye*, and *do to wit*. The amount of labour that necessarily devolves upon the editor of a work of this magnitude is so enormous and so varied that it is not gracious to criticize small details. Yet there are one or two things that strike one. In the first place an undue space seems to us to be given to the bibliographical appendices. Very little is gained by printing a long list of commentaries, say, on a book of Holy Scripture, unless a serious effort is made to eliminate all those which are not first-rate, and to note the distinguishing characteristics of each. For instance, the bibliographical appendix to the article on "Jeremiah" occupies three columns; but it does not supply much information which could not be gained by looking through any great Library Catalogue *sub voce*. What ordinary readers (for whom this Dictionary is, we take it, mainly intended) require is a list of books likely to be within their reach and to be really serviceable. It is much to be desired that the note added by Bishop Lightfoot to his account of the literature that deals with the "Acts" had been duly weighed. "This list," he says, "might be considerably increased, if there were any object in increasing it."

Again, as was pointed out in the preface to the first edition, it is to be expected that "in a work written by various persons, each responsible for his own contributions, differences of opinion" will occur. For instance, the reading "eight" in 2 Chron. xxvi. 9 is adopted on p. 1588 in preference to the "eighteen" of 2 Kings xxiv. 8, whereas a different judgment is laid down on p. 1568. Or again, whether or not the word *almah* connotes virginity may be fair subject for discussion (cf. pp. 1435 and 1457). And it is perhaps desirable that the conflicting views on the vexed question of "The Brethren of the Lord" should both find a place in the Dictionary, but it is surely unnecessary to call attention to this so many times (see pp. xiv., 1514 n., 1517 n., 1806, 1836 n.). And as there is no article at all under the title "Brethren of the Lord" (the subject being discussed under "Brother"), we are surprised to see the erroneous reference given in the old edition repeated on p. 1517 n., while it also appears for the first time at the end of the article "Joseph." Of misprints there seem to be few. On p. 487 line 1, ver. 28 should be ver. 28, and there is a typographical error on p. 1515 n. The editors have revised the list of contributors to the first edition and noted which of them are still living, but they do not seem to be aware that Bishop FitzGerald has been dead for some years. The article "Education" is left unsigned, but it is a reprint of Canon Phillott's contribution to the first edition. But these are slight blemishes in so great a work.

J. H. BERNARD, D.D.

#### THE CAMBRIDGE COMPANION TO THE BIBLE. C. J. Clay & Sons, 1893.

This volume is similar in purpose to the Queen's Printers' *Aids to the Student of the Holy Bible*, which has been before the world for twelve or fifteen years, and by its immense circulation has proved that it supplied a very real want. In both cases the work is composite, different scholars supplying different sections. In the volume before us the amount of information supplied in what is in the most literal sense a *handbook*, is immense. One cannot have everything: and something of real importance has of necessity to be sacrificed in order to get this mass of condensed material into so portable a volume. The print, although perfectly legible, is unpleasantly small; and it would be a severe trial to the eyes to read the book through, even without the glossary, concordance, &c., which occupy just about half the space. For the benefit of those whose eyes are not strong it would be worth while to publish pp. 1-206 in much larger type. There are many who would find

such a volume attractive in comparison with the present one: while there are not a few who simply *dare* not use the present volume at all, because to read two or three pages would mean eyes aching for hours afterwards. This is the one adverse criticism to which the work seems to be fairly open; and in making it one admits that the small print is necessary if a book light to the hand is required. All that is suggested is that a companion edition in much larger type should be issued, either divided into two volumes, or possibly including only half of what is given us here.

The following are the contents of the volume. Professor Ryle leads off with two sections on the Structure of the Bible and on its Limits and Growth. In the latter section the secondary and apocryphal Books of both Old and New Testament are considered; and the Bishop of Durham adds an appendix on Sacred Books of other faiths, *e.g.*, of Confucianism, Taoism, Brahmanism, Buddhism, and Zoroastrianism. The third section, on the Preservation and Translation of the Bible, is mainly the work of Dr. Sinker, the Librarian of Trinity College; but Mr. Murray, of Emmanuel College, supplies the important portion which treats of the Text of the New Testament, while Dr. Moulton, Head Master of the Leys School, adds a compact note on the History of the English Bible. Introductions to the several Books with summaries of their contents form the fourth section. The Bishop of Worcester takes the Hexateuch, Professor Lumby the Historical Books, the Master of St. John's College the Poetical Books, Professor A. Davidson, of Edinburgh, the Prophetic Books, and Professor Ryle the Apocrypha. The New Testament is taken by Mr. Murray, of Emmanuel. These four sections occupy 142 pages: the fifth section, on Bible History, adds 100 pages more, the joint work of Mr. A. Carr, Professor Robertson Smith, Professor Stanton, Professor Armitage Robinson, and Professor Gwatkin. The Chronology of the Bible is discussed by Professor Lumby, who also helps Dr. Watson, Canon Awdry, and Mr. Bevan with the Antiquities. The Geography, Geology, and Climate are appropriately assigned to Professor Bonney. A Glossary, a Concordance, with other lists and indices, each by a different hand, and together occupying over 200 pages, complete the letterpress; and the volume closes with eight excellent maps. In the index of Proper Names no information is given as to pronunciation, nor even as to the quantity of syllables: this, perhaps, might have been supplied with advantage in some cases. One would be sorry that a book of this kind should promote pedantry, by encouraging young curates to startle their congregations with unusual although accurate pronunciations. Yet good service might be done by protecting the ears of those who know better from such atrocities as *Melita*, *Eubulus*, and *Coos* or *Core* pronounced as one syllable. But the volume as it stands is of very great usefulness, and cannot fail to promote an intelligent study of the Bible.

ALFRED PLUMMER, D.D.

**BUDDHISM, PRIMITIVE AND PRESENT, IN MAGADHA AND CEYLON.**

By REGINALD S. COPLESTON, D.D., Bishop of Colombo. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892.

THE present volume has a twofold purpose: first, to describe the primitive Buddhism of northern India, the parent-stock of the varied Buddhist systems of central Asia, Burmah, China, Ceylon, and then to describe the Buddhism of Ceylon, the earliest offshoot, and the purest existing representative, of Buddha's teaching. The author is qualified for his work, not only by study of the original Pali texts, but also by long residence in a Buddhist country and atmosphere, an invaluable addition to mere book-knowledge. It is less the metaphysical side of Buddha's doctrine that is

expounded than the moral side. This is amply illustrated in about eight chapters, other seven chapters being given to Buddhist monasticism, which is, of course, the most perfect realization of the Buddhist ideal. The moral teaching of Buddhism is its strongest side. Bishop Copleston does full justice to its excellencies; but he is not, like many indiscriminate admirers, blind to its defects. The lights and shades are faithfully brought out. The contrast with Christian teaching is pointed out, though it is not pressed in a polemical spirit. The author remarks that, while humanity may be said to be the central, cardinal virtue in the Buddhist code, it is by no means conspicuous in Buddhist practice. "The credit of having first founded hospitals belongs undoubtedly to Buddhism." The brief chapter on the moral ideal of Buddhism is very suggestive. The ideal is made up rather of passive and negative than active virtues, and the omissions are striking. "The idea of conscience has no exact counterpart in the Buddhist system, any more than the Christian idea of sin, as implying moral responsibility, or the transgression of the commands of a Person." Gentleness, repose, purity, earnestness of a certain kind, are the chief aims. The Buddhist, too, has to depend on himself for all things.

It is curious to observe how Buddhism anticipates such modern theories as agnosticism, pessimism, positivism, philosophical empiricism. Its pessimism is thoroughgoing. The way to salvation is conviction, not of sin, but of universal, necessary suffering, and then of the cause of that suffering in desire and individual existence. Ignorance is the one evil to be got rid of; knowledge the grand means of redemption. But, as our author points out, it is ignorance and knowledge of the special tenets of Buddhist doctrine. The system, too, is quite at one with the empirical denial of the existence of the soul, except as the sum of thought and feeling. "The Self, or personality, has no permanent reality; it is the result of certain elements coming together, a combination of faculties and characters." Self, or soul, is merely a popular name for the aggregate of these. So, again, all knowledge is of phenomena; cause is unknown and unknowable. In one of the sacred Sutras we read: "Gotama was asked, 'Do you hold the view that the world is eternal?' He replied, 'No.' 'That the world is not eternal?' 'No.' 'That it has end?' 'No.' 'That it has not an end?' 'No.' 'That the life and the body are the same?' 'No.' 'That the life is one thing and the body another?' 'No.' 'That the individual exists after death?' 'No.' 'That he does not?' 'No.' 'That he both exists and does not exist after death?' 'No.' 'That he neither exists nor does not exist after death?' 'No.'" This doctrine is illustrated by the burning fire. When it goes out, we do not ask where it is gone; we simply say, It is gone out. So is it when man has attained true knowledge. This is the final Nirvana. Our author justly says that Buddhism, unlike Brahminism, knows nothing of absorption in the Supreme, because it has no Supreme.

The Buddhism of Ceylon has remained nearer the primitive theory than the other branches of the system. The first Buddhist missionary to Ceylon was Mahinda, son of the great Buddhist monarch Asoka, in the third century B.C. The author follows the fortunes, and describes the history, of the Ceylon community from those days to the present. In recent times, under the competition of Christianity, an attempt has been made to carry out a Buddhist reformation—i.e., to revert to the original teachings of Buddha. So far the reformation seems to have been mainly confined to educated circles.

We are glad to see the tribute of respect which the author pays to the accuracy of one of the first explorers in this field, Spence Hardy. He says that he purposely avoided consulting the works of the latter until his own work was finished, and then

he was surprised to find how the results of their investigations coincided. The present work is a valuable addition to our sources of information about Buddhism, especially because it is based on personal knowledge, as well as study of written authorities.

J. S. BANKS.

IT may be worth while to point out how much mischief may be done by well-meaning theologians who have but slightly studied the modern criticism of the Old Testament. Dr. Adolf Zahn, one of the very few representatives of old-fashioned Calvinism in Germany, and already known by a reactionary work on the Book of Deuteronomy, and by some not uninteresting though equally unprogressive theological essays, has lately published *Serious Surveys of the Delusion of Modern Old Testament Criticism* (Ernst Blicke, &c., Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1893), one chapter of which is devoted to English pretenders to the name of critic of the Old Testament. These pretenders, it appears, do but copy from German works, and are devoid of independence or originality. Happily a defender of sound views and consummate scholarship has arisen, who on linguistic grounds has shown the futility of Anglo-German criticism. The learned author has derived this information from one of our leading Presbyterian divines, not generally supposed to be an opponent of progress. I forbear to give names; the curious student can find out for himself. It hardly need be added that German criticism is attacked with still greater vehemence, but one may reasonably be surprised that the editor of the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft* should find it necessary to protest against this in the very home of critical theology.

T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D.

**LITERARY DEPARTMENT.**

## BOOK REVIEWS.

SCRIPTURES HEBREW AND CHRISTIAN, arranged and edited for young readers as an introduction to the study of the Bible. I. Hebrew Story from Creation to the Exile. II. Hebrew Literature. III. Christian Scriptures. By EDWARD T. BARTLETT, D.D., Dean of the Protestant Episcopal Divinity School in Philadelphia, and JOHN P. PETERS, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew in the University of Pennsylvania. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1886-93. 8vo, pp. xii., 545; xi., 569; xii., 601, §5.

The object which the editors had in the preparation of these volumes was highly commendable. Those who most appreciate the Bible are those who know it best, and these in turn are those to whom it is a living history as well as vital truth, instinct with purpose and plan. In these volumes the intent has been to give the biblical history and revelation and their Divine unfolding as nearly as possible in biblical language, and "to furnish a sufficient clew for the guidance of the ordinary Bible reader and student." At times the narratives have been condensed and rearranged, with some simplifications of the language for the easier comprehension of the less learned, and for young readers. The guiding principles have been, first and foremost, the sacredness of the volume, and next the sound assumption that, in order to learn aright, the correct point of view must be obtained, so that even partial teaching may be true. It is exceedingly important that the student shall have nothing to unlearn. A competent guide to Scripture is in this regard doubly needful and beneficial. In order to this the revelation of the Bible must be presented to the reader as it was actually presented in its order and progress in accordance with the plan of God. The best interpretation that we can get is that which was in the original unfolding of the redemption which the Bible proclaims. The historical standpoint is thus the one of most value and advantage.

Under the guidance of these thoughts the editors have worked. At times they have presented the books in their order, at others the narratives have been woven together, so that the reader of the Old Testament is brought into contact not only with the actual words of a prophet, but also with the historical setting which gives so much more of meaning to the words which he uttered. The whole thus becomes an organism of developing truth, gaining, not losing, in significance.

The first volume is divided into four

parts: from the Creation to the time of Saul; to Rehoboam; the history of Israel and Samaria from scattered notices, with the prophecies of Amos and Hosea interwoven, the whole forming a continuous narrative; Judah down to the Captivity, the narrative being made up from the books of Kings and Chronicles, with the insertion of the portions of Isaiah and Jeremiah which belong in this connection. Under the history of Josiah those portions of Deuteronomy are introduced which are necessary to the comprehension of the narrative. Thus are brought together all the passages which relate to the same event.

The second volume is divided under six heads. First, the period from the destruction of Jerusalem to the time of Ezra—a period meagre in its record of political history, but ample in its monuments of intellectual, religious, and literary progress. Second, the Hebrew legislation, setting forth the codes of the Pentateuch from a practical standpoint, so that the various provisions can be easily compared. Third, those tales, episodes, such as Ruth and Esther, which could not be woven into a continuous narrative. Fourth, prophecy in those parts easy of comprehension, without an extensive knowledge of contemporaneous events and without extended comment. Fifth, Hebrew poetry, consisting of selections from the Psalms and other lyrical pieces, without any attempt at chronological arrangement. Finally, selections from the wonderful "Wisdom" literature of the Hebrews, the latest development of their religious thought.

The third volume deals with the New Testament. The text is based upon the Revised Version, but it does not follow it exclusively. The whole of the Testament is not given, as this was not considered necessary to the purpose of the series, which is to give an introduction to the historical order of the writings in connection with the historical setting. An excellent feature is the italicizing of the passages quoted from the Old Testament. This serves to point the lesson that the connection between the Old and New Testaments is not only that of temporal sequence, but also of logical consequence in the Divine plan. The order adopted is: Synoptic Gospels and the Acts; General Epistles by the earlier Apostles, James and Peter; the Epistles of Paul in four groups; books belonging to the time of the great tribulation, Hebrews and the Revelation; and books belonging to the closing period of the Apostolic age, Gospel and Epistles of John. A list of quotations from the Old Testament follows at the close.

The series is a monument to that love of the truth which has animated it, and it is a noble attempt to so arrange the portions of Scripture in their order that they shall

appeal to an age which is historical in its instincts and methods.

CHARLES R. GILLETT.

New York.

**CREATION OF THE BIBLE.** By MYRON ADAMS, author of "The Continuous Creation." Boston and New York : Houghton, Mifflin & Co., the Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1892. 8vo, pp. iv., 313.

The title of the book is misleading. "Creation of the Bible" leads one to expect a discussion of the origin of the Bible, or, more precisely, its origin after the analogy of the creation of the universe. Soon discovering that the author means evolution when he says creation, the reader hopes to find a sketch of the successive stages of the progressive revelation. If the inferiority of the earlier is shown, it will be to bring out in contrast the superiority of the later. He is, however, disappointed. There is plenty of the former, but the latter is not very marked. Evolution of the views of the Bible held by the author is well illustrated, but evolution of the Bible is not consistently carried through.

"The Bible, like all creation, defective," seems to be the author's main thesis; for "it is proposed in this book to give in a simple manner some view of recent Bible study. In doing so, certain principles of interpretation will be employed: First, the Bible is a part of creation; second, the order of creation is one of progress and improvement; third, all progress is co-ordinate; fourth, the Bible is to be studied as any book is to be studied; it is properly subject to human criticism; fifth, its contents furnish to a large extent the means for its investigation."

It is needless to say that after this declaration the author does not spare criticism. Indeed, his fourth point is his chief one. He says of himself that "he does not profess to be a critic, but one who has resorted to the critics and to historical criticism for help." If to get help is to become what he is in his views of revelation, many will not follow his example.

There is too much criticism and too little appreciation. He is as dogmatic as the dogmatists. The frame of mind of the average theologian in the past is, 'to be sure, not entirely commendable, but the pendulum cannot stay at one end of its swing any better than the other. There is a position for the Bible student, where he may recognize and acknowledge all the proven facts of literary criticism and at the same time not discard the fundamental truths of Christianity.'

This sentiment is more expressive of the

author's temper of mind than of his whom he would ridicule: "There is no entirely good reason why we should be more stupid about the Bible than about any other book. In fact, there is good reason why we should bring to the Bible a mind which has at least a little clearness."

His view of miracles of the Bible is thus given: "One trouble with the miracles of the Bible is that they have no scientific evidence. They are told us, not by eye-witnesses, and not by persons who know anything beyond the common of a natural order. So far as the form of them is concerned, we may fearlessly render them to the scientific Caesar to whom they belong."

He discards the virgin-birth of Jesus: we do not need the story in the future, for it rests on a slender foundation: man is divine anyway: it would deprive us of fellowship with Christ were His miraculous birth a reality.

In rejecting the idea of sacrifice from the true view of religion he has overlooked the fact that on all sides the principle is to be seen in operation. The farmer uses it when he sows his seed; the moneyed man when he invests his funds. The earlier statement of the principle may be at fault, but the principle cannot be spared, either from the realm of matter or of spirit. The more thoroughly the social system is permeated with it, the better for all mankind. The "sociological religion" of the author will be a capital place to exhibit and foster this idea, which he says "rests upon the imagination. Not only so, but it belongs to the less developed imagination; the imagination of the man who is trained in reasoning does not respond to it."

The book, neatly gotten up and readable, adds nothing valuable to the literature of the subject. The reader will learn what the views of the author's school are, but it is to be hoped that he will not suppose himself to be bound to think with him.

OWEN H. GATES.  
*Oberlin Theological Seminary.*

**MOHAMMEDANISM AND OTHER RELIGIONS OF MEDITERRANEAN COUNTRIES.** By G. T. BETTANY, M.A., B.Sc. London and New York: Ward, Lock, Bowden & Co., 1892. 12mo, pp. vii., 322, \$1.

Mr. Bettany treats of eight different religions within the compass of 320 pages. Of course little more than mere outlines can be expected. For scholars or even thorough students the book is scarcely a real accession to the science of religions, but to those who have only time for a brief compend, the writer has rendered a fairly good service.

The indication or implied promise given in the preface that a "gradual approach

to monotheism will be made to appear in the history of the religions treated" is hardly fulfilled. It seems to be merely a passing recognition of a theory which, on the hypothesis of evolution, assumes in the outset that all religions must of course rise toward monotheism, which is the highest type. It is indeed asserted in Judaism and Mohammedanism, but the latter simply borrowed it in its completeness, and there is no proof whatever that the former reached it by any gradual process.

In treating of the religion of ancient Egypt, the author again assumes a "tendency" or drift toward monotheism, following the opinions of Tiele and Amelia B. Edwards instead of the great preponderance of learned opinion, which regards the earlier stages of the Egyptian religion as far purer than those of a later day.

It is doubtless true that in Egypt, as in most other countries, monotheism in the sense of a worship of one Supreme God coexisted for centuries with the worship of secondary deities, who were either creations or descendants of the *One*; but nowhere is there clearer evidence than in Egypt of an increasing degradation in the number and the character of its swarming polytheistic deities; and with this tendency there was a corresponding decline in morals.

The relations of the Babylonian and Phoenician religions are not clearly traced, though the general character is correctly indicated. Much more emphasis might be given to the enormities of Baalism, with its triple crime and shame of female prostitution, sodomy, and the sacrifice of children. It was the foulest of all heathen systems.

Rather too much space is given to rehearsing the Greek mythology, which is supposed to be already known to the average school-boy, but amends are made by a brief but satisfactory reference to the great leaders of Greek philosophy.

To Mohammedanism Mr. Bettany gives chief attention. In the 130 pages given to ancient and modern Islam a condensed but clear and quite satisfactory outline of the history and the chief characteristics of the system is given. Mohammed is, on the whole, fairly estimated. There is no disposition to settle his historic status with mere ignorant denunciation, nor, on the other hand, is there any flippant and easy-going laudation.

The prophet is presented as a reformer growing into fanaticism, strengthened by persecution, then rendered unscrupulous by success, and swept on finally by his ambition to remorseless cruelty, and covering his lust and marital infidelity with blasphemy. Modern Islam is set forth in its changes and ramifications with painstaking accuracy.

The Teutonic, Slavonic, and Celtic faiths

are but meagrely outlined. The reliable sources, it is but fair to say, are few.

F. F. ELLINWOOD.  
*New York University.*

PAGANISM SURVIVING IN CHRISTIANITY.  
By ABRAM HERBERT LEWIS, D. D. New York : G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1892. 8vo, pp. xv., 309, \$1.75.

It is by no means an easy matter to decide whether the merits or the demerits of the work before us preponderate, for both are considerable. The scholarship manifested is respectable, the industry of the author in bringing together from many sources striking and effective materials, and his skill in arranging them are worthy of all praise. With many of his conclusions we heartily concur; indeed, they are commonly accepted by scholars whose views are widely different from ours or his. On the other hand, one's appreciation of the book suffers from the author's manifestly polemical aim. The work is in an emphatic sense a "tendency" production. The author, as is well known, is the literary leader of the Seventh Day Baptists, and is devoting himself assiduously to the defence and propagation of the dogma that the Jewish Sabbath is of perpetual obligation, and that the great mass of Christians are guilty of the most grievous disobedience to the Divine command in disregarding the Jewish Sabbath and in making the Lord's Day the weekly time for rest and special religious exercises. He edits a magazine devoted solely to this cause, and his books and pamphlets on this subject are numerous. No one acquainted with his career and his habits of mind could conceive of his devoting himself to historical research in a purely scientific interest, or could imagine him writing a book in which the defence of Sabbatarianism occupied other than the most prominent position.

In chapter 1, twenty-three writers, representing many denominations and modes of thought, are quoted to show that much of paganism survived in the Christianity which gradually supplanted the old cults, and which, after the union of Church and State, absorbed the great mass of paganism without any adequate effort to transform it. This is universally acknowledged, and scarcely needed to be so elaborately proved. Circumstances being as they were, the paganization of Christianity was, so far as we can see, inevitable.

In chapter 2 the author proceeds to show, by like quotations from writers, ancient and modern, that pagan methods of interpreting Scripture from the second century onward became dominant and contributed much to the corruption of Christian doctrine. Here he relies largely upon

Hatch, Harnack, and Baur (the last name he uniformly writes "Bauer"). That the allegorical method of interpretation was pagan in its origin, and that it exerted a highly corrupting influence on Christian thought from the earliest post-apostolic time is undeniable.

The third, fourth, fifth, and sixth chapters are devoted to water-worship, which the author proves by ample quotations to have been of world-wide prevalence, and by the influence of which he seeks to account for the early appearance in the Christian Church of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, belief in the magical efficacy of water-baptism, belief in the necessity of water-baptism to salvation, and the consequent rise and growth of the doctrine and practice of infant baptism. That the progressive departure of the early Church from apostolic precept and example as regards the nature and the subject of baptism was due largely to pagan influences seems highly probable; though the author lays more stress on these influences than is meet.

Chapters 7-14 are devoted to an effort to show that Sunday is a purely pagan institution. The author brings together a large amount of material to show the wide prevalence throughout the Roman Empire of the observance of Sunday (the day of Apollo, of the Persian Mithras, etc.), and lays much stress on the well-known fact that Constantine made Sunday a legal holiday quite as much in honor of the sun god as in honor of Christ. He attempts at considerable length to show that there is no warrant either in apostolic precept or example for the substitution of the first day for the seventh, ignoring or lightly setting aside the considerations by which those who believe in the perpetual obligation of the Jewish Sabbath justify the change from the seventh to the first day of the week.

We shall not attempt here to refute the author's views, which we believe to be erroneous and mischievous; we may be allowed to express the opinion, however, that Sabbatarianism cannot be successfully met by those who maintain the perpetual obligation of ceremonial Sabbath observance.

ALBERT H. NEWMAN.  
McMaster University, Toronto.

PRAYER-MEETING THEOLOGY. A Dialogue. By E. J. MORRIS. New York: Putnam's Sons, 1892. 12mo, pp. 263, \$1.25.

A different title would, perhaps, have been more attractive to some, at least, of those who will find this book to their mind. All that it has to do with prayer-meetings is, that the personages of the dialogue got into their discussion at the end of a prayer-meeting. They are moral people, members of a little Congregational

church in a Welsh settlement away back in Pennsylvania. For all that, they talk in the same elevation of style and thought above that sort of people that Milton gives to Farmer Adam and wife. It is, however, animated talk, out of a full mind, and the parts are well sustained. A is a sturdy believer, who never had a doubt, and is hard on doubters and unbelievers, thinking it better to be unconciliatory but true, than to be tender to men's feelings while treacherous to their souls. B is plagued with doubts that he cannot solve, but he fights them down by tenacity of resolution to believe the church doctrine. C has thought through it all, and rests his faith on the essential grounds of religious belief more than on the formal "evidences" as presented in the books. The talk of these friends takes a wide sweep, including the being and personality of God, the problem of evil, the question of immortality, the authority of the Bible, miracles, the person of Christ, the Resurrection, Christian unity, future punishment, Unitarianism, and agnosticism. C, despite his avowal that he still believes, in spite of inward rebellion, in endless punishment, very ably contends in all other points for liberal positions, but does not succeed in convincing his friends, A regarding him with dismay as a heretic, and B taking to the cold comfort that he can only offer the prayer of doubt in place of the prayer of faith. With this *reductio ad absurdum* of the opposition, C seems to be left in possession of the field. The book is ably written and helpful to one who is troubled with speculative difficulties in religious truth, and strongly in the interest of Christian charity and catholicity.

JAMES M. WHITON.

New York.

#### BRIEF NOTICES, BY THE EDITOR.

We take pleasure in calling attention to three new issues of the Expositor's Bible series: *The Book of Joshua*, by Professor William Garden Blaikie, D.D., LL.D., of New College, Edinburgh (pp. viii., 416); *The First Book of Kings*, by F. W. Farrar, D.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of Westminster (pp. xii., 503); and *Era, Nehemiah, and Esther*, by Walter F. Adeney, M.A., Professor of New Testament Exegesis and Church History, New College, London (pp. viii., 404). New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1893, crown 8vo, \$1.50 each. It would be very easy to point out excellencies in any and all of these works. They are worthy of places beside the earlier volumes which have uniformly received favorable review in these columns. Especially timely and apt is the introductory essay in Archdeacon Farrar's volume, on "The Higher Criticism," not because

it contains anything particularly new, but on account of the speaker, the spirit and the form of his words. The character of the books in general is of a high order, and they promise to be very useful to those fortunate enough to possess them.

*The Doctrine of the Prophets.* The Warburtonian Lectures for 1886-90. By A. F. Kirkpatrick, Regius Professor of Hebrew, Trinity College, Cambridge. (New York : Macmillan & Co., 1892, crown 8vo, pp. xvii., 540, \$1.75.) This is a very valuable addition to the literature of Old Testament study. It is intended to set forth the contributions of the various prophets to the sum and progress of Divine truth revealed in the course of the older dispensation. These are placed in connection with their historical settings, so as to display the interaction of providence and revelation, proving at once the naturalness and the supernaturalness of the whole as a unique, Divine revelation to the world. The author has thus exhibited the prophecies from the standpoint of their delivery rather than of their fulfilment.

*The Gospel of the Kingdom.* A popular exposition of the Gospel according to Matthew. By C. H. Spurgeon. With introductory note by Mrs. C. H. Spurgeon, and an introduction to the American edition by Arthur T. Pierson. (New York : Baker & Taylor Co., 12mo, pp. viii., 502.) This latest of the publications from the pen of the eminent preacher is a welcome memorial of his genius. It is not eminent for novelty nor for any striking diction, but it will be received with joy by many because of the directness with which it goes to the teaching of the passages expounded, setting forth the truth with simplicity and power.

*Christ and Criticism.* Thoughts concerning the relation of Christian faith to biblical criticism. By Charles Marsh Mead, D.D., Professor in Hartford Theological Seminary. (New York : Randolph, 1893, 12mo, pp. xi., 186, 75 cents.) Professor Mead seems to blow both hot and cold so far as the Higher Criticism is concerned. In his preface he boldly says : "I regard the higher criticism as not only entirely legitimate, but as very useful, and indiscriminate condemnation of it as foolish." He then goes on to deprecate the "results" of the existing criticism, with more or less of repetition of the arguments now so familiar. The explanation may be that his approval affects the ideal critical procedure, but his reprobation attaches to the actual. His work will doubtless have the effect of convincing the already convinced.

*Faith and Criticism.* Essays by Congregationalists. (New York : Dutton & Co., 1893, 12mo, pp. viii., 430, \$2.) As indicated by the title, the nine papers which compose this volume have been inspired by the purpose to help "those very numerous seekers after truth, whose minds have been disturbed by the work of criticism in biblical and theological questions." They are not directed to the learned, but to those who know enough to appreciate the fact that fear and prejudice are no sufficient arguments against scholarly investigation and progress; and to those who, believing that all truth is from one source, desire to see the reconciliation of truths which some have dogmatically declared to be incompatible. To this and all similar efforts we would bid welcome and success.

*The Decalogue.* By Elizabeth Wordsworth. (London and New York : Longmans, Green & Co., 12mo, 1893, pp. xxiii., 240, \$1.25.) The author is the daughter of Bishop Wordsworth, and the Principal of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford. The discussions which make up the volume were given as talks before some of the young lady students under the author's charge on Sunday evenings. They are remarkably clear and "practical," a valuable addition to the literature of the subject from a side not heretofore cultivated. They are calculated to build up strong and true character.

*I Believe in God, the Father Almighty.* By John Henry Barrows. (Chicago and New York : Revell, 1892, 12mo, pp. 187, \$1.) Four discourses on theism, suggested by the first clause of the Apostles' Creed; well and effectively written, and calculated to impress the lessons of the strength, truth, and comfort of theistic belief, as against the uncertainty of doubt and the despair of denial.

*A Short History of the Book of Common Prayer,* together with certain papers illustrative of liturgical revisions, 1878-92. By William Reed Huntington, D.D., rector of Grace Church. (New York : Whittaker, 1893, 12mo, pp. 235, \$1.) The "Short History" is now first printed; the other papers have appeared in periodicals, and serve to set forth the work of revision, with the author's connection therewith. Comment is needless.

*Christ and Modern Unbelief.* By Randolph Harrison McKim, rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington. (New York : Whittaker, 1893, pp. iv., 146, \$1.) Seven lectures, apologetic in character, aimed to defend the central position of the Christian truth regarding the person

of Christ. They are written in a clear and simple style, the result of careful and scholarly thought; aimed to do good to an audience composed of teachers and taught; and form an interesting contribution to the "rediscovery of Christ by modern theology."

*In Spirit and in Truth.* Essays by younger ministers of the Unitarian Church. With an introduction by the Rev. James De Normandie. (Boston: G. H. Ellis, 1893, 8vo, pp. 163, \$1.) Suggestive papers upon subjects of importance in religious life and thought. Some of the topics are "The Philosophy of Religion," "The Revelation of God in Nature," "The Thought of God in the Bible," "The Revelation of God in Man," and "The Christ."

*Sermons*, preached in St. John's Church, Washington, D. C., by George William Douglas, S.T.D. (New York: Randolph & Co., 1893, 8vo, pp. viii, 294, \$1.50.) This volume contains twenty-one sermons, published at the request of former parishioners as a memorial of a pastorate. They are of interest not only in this connection, but also for their own sake, on account of the spirit which informs them.

*Primary Convictions.* By William Alexander, D.D., Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. (New York: Harpers, 1893, pp. xvi, 322, 8vo.) It is matter of congratulation that these lectures have appeared in print. They comprise, with some additions, the Columbia College Lectures on the evidences of Christianity, delivered a little over a year ago. In form they are sermons; in substance, a commentary on the clauses of the Apostles' Creed.

*Outlines of the History of Dogma.* By Dr. Adolf Harnack, Professor of Church History in the University of Berlin. Translated by Edwin Knox Mitchell, Professor of Greco-Roman and Eastern Church History in Hartford Theological Seminary. (New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1893, 8vo, pp. xii, 567, \$2.50.) The task of translating such a book as that of Dr. Harnack is one of exceeding difficulty; and when translated it is likely to be of service only to those who possess an intimate knowledge of the subject. It is, therefore, not probable that the volume will ever become the *vade mecum* of the theological student or of the pastor, despite the great importance which attaches to the works and investigations of the distinguished author. We regret to be compelled in all honesty to say that the character and quality of the translation is not likely to assist in the popularization of the

views of Professor Harnack, since it would be easy to find innumerable faults with the renderings here given in ways too numerous for present mention.

*Studies in the Civil, Social, and Ecclesiastical History of Early Maryland.* Lectures delivered to the young men of the Agricultural College of Maryland. By the Rev. Theodore C. Gambrall, D.D. (New York: Whitaker, 1893, 8vo, pp. vii, 240, \$1.50.) Dr. Gambrall is already known through his "Church Life in Colonial Maryland." In the present volume he has traced a very interesting chapter in the early history of this country, showing the course of progress from the peculiar conditions of the original charter of Maryland to broader and truer ideas of human liberty. He has given a philosophical view of the case, and has not been content to relate merely the external facts of the history.

*Straight Sermons* to young men and other human beings. Preached before the Universities of Yale, Harvard, and Princeton. By Henry van Dyke, D.D., pastor of the Brie Church, New York. (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1893, 12mo, pp. xiii, 238, \$1.25.) The odd designation of these discourses is fully justified by the directness which characterizes the author in his approach to the subjects which he discusses. There is no cant in his designation of his intention in addressing them to "human beings." His life, faith, work, and purpose are real and downright, and the sermons reflect the man.

*Moses, the servant of God.* By F. B. Meyer. (New York and Chicago: Revell, pp. 190, \$1.) The value of this book lies not in the historical lore which it contains, but in the wonderful facility of the author for drawing deep and useful lessons of comfort and impulse from simple and plain statements of the text of Scripture. To him the Bible is replete with spiritual truth.

*Future Tenses of the Blessed Life.* By F. B. Meyer. (The same, pp. 162.) A sweet book of comfort, and a worthy companion to "The Present Tenses," which appeared some time since.

*Missionary Landscapes in the Dark Continent.* By Rev. James Johnston, A.T.S. (New York: Randolph & Co., 1893, 12mo, pp. 264.) Mr. Johnston does not pretend to have given a history of African missions, but he has presented a series of most interesting views of the field at certain points. The sketches are vivid and good.

and the tale is one to cause rejoicing in the hearts of those to whom the missionary command is dear. Some of the topics treated are the following: "Nyassa, 'The Lake of the Stars';" "Evangelization in Egypt and the Nile Valley;" "Uganda under Conquest;" "The Universities Mission to Central Africa;" "Sunrise in Kafra;" "Missionary Advance up the Congo Waterway;" "Missions on the Niger River." The chapters are not too long, but they contain a large amount of information in readable form.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

**Buck, Robert, B.A.** *Revelation by Character*. New York: Wilbur B. Ketcham, 2 Cooper Union. \$2.00.

**De Witt, John, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.** *What is Inspiration?* New York: A. D. Randolph & Co., 182 Fifth Ave. \$1.00.

**Dixon, A. C.** *Pastor of the Hanson Place Baptist Church*, Brooklyn, N. Y. Milk and Meat: Twenty-four sermons. "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the Word, that ye may grow thereby" (1 Peter ii. 2); "But strong meat belongeth to them that of full age" (Heb. v. 14). New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 740-742 Broadway.

**Fuller, F. W.** *The Primitive Saints and See of Rome*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.; New York: 15 E. 16th St., 1893.

**Gardner, Hattie Sleeper.** *The Endeavours of Maple Grove*. Omaha, Neb.: Megeath Stationery Co., 1304 Farnam St.

**Guirey, George, Rev.** *Author of "The Unanswerable Word," "Is the Bible True?" "How to Open the Windows of Heaven," etc.* The Hallowed Day: Fletcher Prize Essay, Dartmouth College, 1892. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 740-742 Broadway.

**Strong, Josiah, Rev., D.D.** *General Secretary of the Evangelical Alliance for the United States. The New Era: or, The Coming Kingdom*. New York: Baker & Taylor Co., 740-742 Broadway.

**Sunderland, Jabez Thomas.** *The Bible, its Origin, Growth, and Character, and its place among the Sacred Books of the World*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 27 W. 23d St.; London: 24 Bedford St., Strand, 1893.

## AUGUST MAGAZINES.

HARPER'S Magazine for August contains: "Polyeuct and Pauline," frontispiece; "The Cock Lane Ghost" (a story), Howard Pyle; "Greenwich Village," Thomas A. Janvier; "The Handsome Humes" (a novel), Part III., William Black; "His Bad Angel" (a story), Richard Harding Davis; "Polyeuct and Pauline" (a poem), E. W. Latimer; "The Dead Lover" (a Roumanian Folk-song), R. H. Stoddard; "Italian Gardens," Part II., Charles A. Platt; "Riders of Tuns" (Colonel T. A. Dodge, U.S.A.); "Horace Chase" (novel), Part VIII., Constance Fenimore Woolson; "Bride Roses" (scene), William D. Howells; "A Queer Little Family on the Bittersweet," William Hamilton Gibson; "A Cast of the Net" (a story), Her-

bert D. Ward; "Black Water and Shallows," Frederick Remington; "A Landscape by Conestable" (a story), F. Mary Wilson; "At the Hermitage" (a story), E. Levi Brown; "A Lament for the Birds," Susan Fenimore Cooper; "Editor's Study," Charles Dudley Warner; "Monthly Record of Current Events;" "Editor's Drawer."

THE AUGUST CENTURY contains: "Portrait of Phillips Brooks," frontispiece; "Fez, the Mecca of the Moors," Stephen Bonsai; "Phillips Brooks's Letters to Children," Phillips Brooks; "The Prince and Princess Achille Murat in Florida," Matilda L. McConnell; "Fox and Crows," from a painting by Winslow Homer; "Cap Defenders Old and New," W. P. Stephens; "The White Islander," Part III., Mary Hartwell Catherwood; "Little Nell," from a group "Dickens and Little Nell;" "Balcony Stories: One of Us; The Little Convent Girl," Grace King; "Breathing Movements as a Cure," Thomas J. Mays; "Farmer Eli's Vacation," Alice Brown; "The Famines in Eastern Russia: Relief Work of the Younger Tolstoy," Jonas Stadling; "An Artist's Letters from Japan: Yokohama—Kamakura," John La Farge; "Contemporary Japanese Art," Ernest Francisco Fenollosa; "A Swedish Etcher" (Anders Zorn), Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer; "Mr. Jones's Experiment," James Sager Norton; "The Poet," Frank Dempster Sherman; "The Philosophers' Camp," W. J. Stillman; "A Sister of Saintes," Marion Libby; "Benefits Forgot," IX., Wolcott Balestier; "Quatrains," Thomas Bailey Aldrich; "At Niagara," Richard Watson Gilder; "The Redemption," Edward Eggleston; "August," John Vance Cheney.

THE contents of SCHENKEL'S MAGAZINE for August are: "For Awhile No One Said a Word," frontispiece; "The House on the Hill-Top," by Grace Eliza Channing; "The Newspaper Correspondent," by Julian Ralph; "A Sin-Offering," by W. G. Van Tassel Sutphin; "Beneath the Mask," by Howard Pyle; "A Song," by Robert Bridges; "Tiemann's to Tubby Hawk," by H. C. Tanner; "Types and People of the Fair," by J. A. Mitchell; "The Copperhead," Chapters III.—V., by Harold Frederic; "Her Dying Words," by Thomas Bailey Aldrich; "The Flight of Betsey Lane," by Sarah Orne Jewett; "The Opinions of a Philosopher," Chapters VI.—VIII., by Robert Grant; "Silent Amycile," by Edith M. Thomas; "The Wedding Journey of Mrs. Zaintree (Born Greenleaf)," by William Henry Shelton.

THE contents of LIPPINCOTT'S for August are: "In the Midst of Alarms," Robert Barr; "Zachary Taylor, his Home and Family," Anna Robinson Watson; "The National Game," (Athletic Series), Norton B. Young; "Freedom," Clara Jessup Moon; "Jane's Holiday" (Lippincott's Notable Stories, No. VI.), Valerie Hays Brown; "The Dream-Ship," M. H. G.; "The Lady of the Lake," Julian Hawthorne; "Mortality," Howard Hall; "A Philadelphia Sculptor," E. Leslie Gilliland; "Supermundane Fiction," W. H. Babcock; "Men of the Day," M. Crofton.

THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY for August contains: "His Vanished Star," III., IV., Charles Egbert Cradock; "Washington the Winter before the War," Henry L. Dawes; "The Meeting of the Ships," Walter Mitchell; "Little Boy Blue," Olive Thorne Miller; "The Teaching of the Upanishads," William Davies; "A Strategic Movement," Ellen Olney Kirk; "Jonathan Belcher, a Royal Governor of Massachusetts," George Edward Ellis; "A Boston Schoolgirl in 1771," Alice Morse Earle; "The First Principal of Newnham College," Eugenia Skelding; "The Breakers," Charles Washington Coleman; "The Ogre of Alewife Cove," Edith M. Thomas; "Studies in the Correspondence of Petrarch," H. Harriet Waters Preston and Louise Dodge; "Ben," A. M. Ewell; "Relations of Academic and Technical Instruction," Nathaniel Southgate Shaler; "Anti-Slavery History and Biography;" "Comment on New Books;" "The Contributors' Club."

## INDEX OF PERIODICALS, JULY, 1893.

Abbreviations of Magazine Titles used in the Index of Periodicals.

At. M. E. R. African M. E. Church Review. (Quarterly.)	Miss. R. Missionary Review.
A. R. Andover Review. (Bi-monthly.)	N. C. Q. New Christian Quarterly.
B. S. Bibliotheca Sacra. (Quarterly.)	N. H. M. Newbery House Magazine.
B. W. The Biblical World.	N. W. The New World.
B. Q. R. Baptist Quarterly Review.	O. D. Our Day.
Ch. Q. R. Church Quarterly Review.	P. E. R. Protestant Episcopal Review.
C. M. Q. Canadian Methodist Quarterly.	P. M. Preacher's Magazine.
C. R. Charities Review.	P. Q. Presbyterian Quarterly.
C. T. Christian Thought.	P. K. R. Presbyterian and Reformed Review.
Ex. T. Expositor.	(Quarterly.)
G. W. Expository Times.	R. Ch. Review of the Churches.
H. R. Good Words.	R. Q. R. Reformed Quarterly Review.
K. M. Homiletic Review.	R. R. R. Religious Review of Reviews.
L. Q. Katholische Missionen.	S. A. H. Sunday at Home.
M. R. Lutheran Quarterly.	S. M. Sunday Magazine.
M. H. Methodist Review. (Bi-monthly.)	T. Tr. The Treasury.
	Y. R. The Yale Review.
Abelard's Doctrine of Atonement, Hastings Rashdall, Ex.	Free Church of Scotland, The Celebration of the Jubilee of the RCh.
Africa and the Educated and Wealthy Negroes of America, J. G. Robinson, AFMER.	French Protestants in 1892, Theological Thought among A. Grétilat, PRR.
Agnosticism: Its Ethical and Religious Tendencies, W. Quance, CMQ.	General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, The, John de Witt, PRR.
American Board of Help in Bohemia? Has the, Alois Adlof, MH.	Glen Nevis, A Midsummer Day in, Nether Lochaber, GW.
American Board Therein, Bohemia and the Work of the, Francis Kadlec, MH.	Gospels Composed? How Were the Four, William G. T. Shedd, PRR.
American Board in Spain, The Work of the, Enrique de Tienda, MH.	Gospel of Hope and Help, The, C. E. Eberman, TTr.
Apostolic Churches: Their Doctrine and Fellowship, The, Robert A. Watson, PM.	Gräbner's History, Professor J. Nicum, LQ.
Baptized for the Dead, Talbot W. Chambers, PRR.	Harms, Louis, James Douglas, MissR.
Beet's, "Through Christ to God," David H. Lawrence, ExT.	Heresy, The Dishonesty of, Jacob Cooper, RQR.
Bible, Exploring the, W. A. Labrin, PM.	How I Saved My Father, Vivian Brooke, NHM.
Bible Study, Chancellor Burwash, CMQ.	Incidents and Emblems, James Hastings, ExT.
Bishop of the New World, A Model, S. Linton Bell, SM.	Individual, The Value of the, W. N. Ashman, RQR.
Black Codes in the Southern States, New, Joseph Cook, OD.	Inspiration, Some Recent German Discussions on, Benjamin B. Warfield, PRR.
British Guiana, William Walrond, AFMER.	Inspiration, The Theanthropy of, A. W. Haas, LQ.
Carriage, That Fine, Edwin Whelpton, SM.	James Goldsbury, Jr., MH.
Charles P. Krauth, Adolph Spaeth, LQ.	James Thomson, Hugh Halliburton, GW.
Christ's Atonement, The Nature of, III., W. Jackson, CMQ.	Jesuit, The True and the Fictitious, Charles C. Starbuck, PQ.
Christ on Character, The Influence of, VII., Bishop of Ripon, GW.	Jesus, In the Light of, B. Waugh, SM.
Christ, The Unfinished Teaching of, Frederic Relton, ExT.	Jubilee Remembrances, Newman Hall, SM.
Christianity, The Survivals of, George C. Foley, PER.	Kilima-Ndscharo, KM.
Christianity in the Roman Empire, Professor Mommsen, Ex.	Kingdom of God, The, J. H. Bernard, James Orr, Caleb Scott, Alexander Stuart, ExT.
Christianity in America, Four Centuries of, H. M. Scott, OD.	Kings and their Councillors, E. Elmer Harding, ExT.
Church, The Lazy, Frank M. Goodchild, TTr.	Labor War, The, S. E. Keeble, PM.
Churches, The Progress of the, Archdeacon Sinclair, J. Reid Howat, Dr. Mackennal, Dr. Clifford, P. W. Bunting, RCh.	Lay Work and How to Secure It, C. Clever, RQR.
Church and the Empire, The, Professor W. Ramsay, Ex.	Malachi, The Prophecy of, E. H. Dewart, CMQ.
Critician, The Higher, Bishop Tanner, AFMER.	Marie Averie, The Church of St., W. A. Webb, NHM.
Crucifixion of Christ, The, G. Lorimer, TTr.	Mark xvi. 9-20, Some Early Evidences for, C. Taylor, Ex.
Crucifixion, The Date of, Arthur Wright, BW.	Markwick, W. F., TTr.
Curiosity and Obligation, Thomas G. Selby, PM.	Marsovan, Relief of, MH.
Difficult Words of Christ, The, III., James Stalker, Ex.	Menominee-Indianen, Ein Jahr unter den, KM.
Diligence, The Power of, A. Maclaren, TTr.	Metrical Theories as to Old Testament Poetry, Edwin Cone Bissell, PRR.
Empty Shells, Harry Jones, GW.	Micronesia, Volunteers for, MH.
Esther, The Book of, A. H. Hulzinga, PQ.	Missions to Romanies, W. J. Mornan, MissR.
Étienne Bersier, G. Kingscote, NHM.	Mission, Madrid Undenominational, Albert R. Fenn, MissR.
Evolution and Christian Ethics, Thomas G. Apple, RQR.	Missions, Education and, A. J. Gordon, MissR.
Ex. iv. 6-22, The Chronology of, Bishop of Bath, Ex.	Missions in India, The Present Aspect of, II., James Kennedy, MissR.
Fall, The Babylonian Story of, W. St. Chad Boscawen, ExT.	Missions, Educational Work in, William Ashmore, MissR.
Fatherhood of God, Homiletic Aspect of the, Charles A. Salmon, PRR.	Mission Work, The Lutheran Church and, Hugo W. Hoffman, LQ.
Frederick Godet, A. Grétilat, ExT.	Missions and Colonies, C. C. Starbuck, AR.
	Missionenbischofe, Die in 1892 verstorbenen, KM.
	Modern Thought, The Place of Christ in, C. A. Beckwith, AR.
	Mohammedanism, Sectarianism and, Missions as Illustrated in, Dean A. Walker, BW.
	Moor, The, Canon Atkinson, SM.

Moses : His Life and Its Lessons, XII., Mark Guy Pearse, PM.  
 Moths and Butterflies, Agnes Giberne, NHM.  
 Natural Religion and the Gospel, John L. Girardeau, PQ.  
 New England Dogmatic, A. Henry E. Jacobs, LQ.  
 Newman Hall at Home, Dr., SM.  
 New Testament Greek, How to Begin the Study of, H. R. Martin Pope, PM.  
 Nile, A Serpent of the Old, James Graham, GW.  
 Non-Jurors, The, Mrs. Buckley-Owen, NHM.  
 Northern Lights, Under the, W. V. Taylor, SM.  
 Old Testament, The Teaching of Our Lord as to the Authority of the, C. J. Ellicott, Ext.  
 Papal Assumptions of Boniface VIII, Failure of the, Alan D. Campbell, PRR.  
 Paul's Conception of Christianity, St., VII., Professor A. B. Bruce, Ex.  
 Peace, The Way of, James A. Waddell, PQ.  
 Philosophy of Progress, The, D. J. Jordan, AMER.  
 Picardy Pastoral, A, Robert Richardson, GW.  
 Preaching, Successful, Thomas Cook, PM.  
 Priesthood in Israel and Egypt, The Development of, James Henry Breasted, BW.  
 Primary Education, Early, Mrs. Hermann, NHM.  
 Psychology, H. H. Moore, CMQ.  
 Pulpit, Honesty in the, A. Z. Conrad, TTr.  
 Red-Cross Knight, A Modern, E. S. Hinks, PER.  
 Reformation among the Latin Races in Europe, 1865-75, The Movement toward Religious, George Williamson Smith, PER.  
 Reformed Church in the United States, The, A. E. Truxal, RQR.  
 Religions, The World's Parliament of, RCh.  
 Repentance, The Real, Austin Clare, NHM.  
 Reunion Conference, The Programme of, RCh.  
 Ritschian Theology of Germany, The Liberal and the, Frank C. Porter, AR.  
 Rome Governed the Provinces, How, W. C. Marcy, BW.  
 Romish View of the British Indian Government, A, Samuel Mateer, MissR.  
 Ruskin's Titles, Mrs. E. T. Cook, GW.  
 Russian Dissenters and the Russian Government, SM.  
 Sermons, How Men Get their, PM.  
 Servetus, The Trial of, Charles W. Shields, PRR.  
 Silver, The Coinage of, Thomas Fortaine, AMER.  
 Social Myopia, A Case of, George R. Stetson, AR.  
 Scepticism, The Benefit of True, C. A. Little, RQR.  
 Socrates once More, Henry M. Tyler, AR.  
 Spirit, The Witness of the, T. Watson Smith, CMQ.  
 Students of the Old World, A New Movement among, Luther D. Wishard, MissR.  
 Suffolk Moated Halls, J. E. Tailor, GW.  
 Sunday Closing, Field Work for, W. F. Crafts, OD.  
 Swedish Orders, The Validity of, Horace Burr, PER.  
 Temperance in the Public School, John W. Norris, AMER.  
 Theophilus Gould Steward, Isaiah C. Wears, AMER.  
 Theology in the Middle Ages, Scholastic and Mystic, Philip Schaff, RQR.  
 Thirwall, The Charges of Bishop, Carl E. Grammer, PER.  
 Thorny Subject, A. W. Anderson Smith, GW.  
 Temptation of Jesus, The, W. F. Markwick, TTr.  
 Voluntary Societies and the Churches, C. R. Vaughan, PQ.  
 Washington : His Life and Its Lessons, David Gregg, TTr.  
 Wayside Station, At a, G. W. Wood, SM.  
 Wesleyan Missionary Controversy, The Inner History of, RCh.  
 Whittier, John Greenleaf, James O. Murray, PRR.  
 Women in Public Worship in the Churches of Paul, George H. Gilbert, BW.  
 Women and Children, II., Laura Riddings, NHM.

## CONTENTS OF RELIGIOUS PERIODICALS.

## THE A. M. E. CHURCH REVIEW.

Philadelphia, July, 1893.

The Free Coinage of Silver.  
 The Higher Criticism.  
 The Philosophy of Progress.

British Guiana.  
 Theophilus Gould Steward, Temperance in the Public Schools and in the Sunday Schools.  
 Literature a Pillar of Strength.  
 Africa and the Educated and Wealthy Negroes of America.  
 A Southern City.  
 Niobe.  
 Bishop John M. Brown.

## THE ANDOVER REVIEW.

Boston, July, 1893.

The Place of Christ in Modern Thought.  
 Socrates once More.  
 A Case of Social Myopia.  
 Missions and Colonies.  
 The Liberal and the Ritschian Theology of Germany.

## THE BIBLICAL WORLD.

Chicago, July, 1893.

The Date of the Crucifixion.  
 Sectarianism and Missions as Illustrated in Mohammedanism.  
 The Development of Priesthood in Israel and Egypt.  
 How Rome Governed the Provinces.  
 Women in Public Worship in the Churches of Paul.

## THE CANADIAN METODIST QUARTERLY.

Toronto, Montreal, Halifax, July, 1893.

The Prophecy of Malachi.  
 Agnosticism : Its Ethical and Religious Tendencies.  
 Psychology.  
 The Witness of the Spirit.  
 The Nature of Christ's Atonement.  
 "The Land Shall not be Sold Forever."  
 Bible Study.

## THE EXPOSITOR.

London, July, 1893.

Christianity in the Roman Empire.  
 The Church and the Empire in the First Century.  
 St. Paul's Conception of Christianity : VII., The Doctrine of Sin.  
 Abelard's Doctrine of Atonement.  
 The Chronology of Ezra iv. 6-23.  
 The Difficult Words of Christ : III., Things New and Old.  
 Some Early Evidence for the Twelve Verses, St. Mark xvi. 9-20.

## THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Edinburgh, July, 1893.

The Babylonian Story of the Fall.  
 Frederick Godet.  
 The Unfinished Teaching of Christ.  
 The Teaching of Our Lord as to the Authority of the Old Testament.  
 Beet's "Through Christ to God."  
 Kings and their Councillors.  
 Incidents and Emblems.  
 The Kingdom of God.  
 The Gospels and Modern Criticism.  
 Professor Marshall's Theory of an Aramaic Gospel.

## GOOD WORDS.

London, July, 1893.

Empty Shells.  
 Suffolk Moated Halls.  
 A Thorny Subject.  
 James Thomson.  
 Mr. Ruskin's Titles.  
 A Serpent of Old Nile.  
 A Picardy Pastoral.  
 A Midsummer Day in Glen Nevis.  
 The Influence of Christ on Character, VII.

## DIE KATHOLISCHEN MISSIONEN.

Freiburg im Breisgau, July, 1893.

Die im Jahre 1892 verstorbenen Missionsbischöfe.  
Auf dem Kilmala-Nedischaro.  
Ein Jahr unter den Menominee-Indianern.  
Nachrichten aus den Missionen: Roumenia, Mesopotamia, China, Farther India, Africa, Oceania.

## THE LUTHERAN CHURCH REVIEW.

Philadelphia, July, 1893.

A New England Dogmatic.  
The Theanthropy of Inspiration.  
Charles Porterfield Krauth.  
Professor Gräbner's History.  
The Lutheran Church and Mission.

## THE MISSIONARY HERALD.

Boston, July, 1893.

Relief of Marsovan.  
Volunteers for Micronesia.  
The Work of the American Board in Spain.  
Bohemia and the Work of the American Boards  
Therein.  
How Has the American Board Been of Help in Bohemia?  
Letters from the Missions: Micronesia, Mexico,  
Central Africa, Turkey, Madura, China, Japan.

## THE MISSIONARY REVIEW.

London, New York, Toronto, July, 1893.

Missions to Romanists.  
Louis Harsus.  
Madrid Undenominational Mission.  
A New Movement among the Students in the Old  
World.  
Education and Missions.  
A Romish View of the British Indian Government.  
The Present Aspect of Missions in India, II.  
Educational Work in Missions.

## THE NEWBERRY HOUSE MAGAZINE.

London, July, 1893.

Some Leaders of the Church Movement.  
Early Primary Education.  
The Non-Jurors.  
The Church of St. Mary Overie.  
Eugène Bersier.  
A Real Repentance.  
Moths and Butterflies.  
Women and Children, II.  
How I Saved my Father.  
A Great Eye.

## OUR DAY.

Boston and Chicago, July, 1893.

Four Centuries of Christianity in America.  
Field Work for Sunday Closing.  
New Black Codes in the Southern States.  
Joseph Cook on Ultimate Religious Journalism.

## THE PREACHER'S MAGAZINE.

New York, July, 1893.

Curiosity and Obligation.  
The Apostolic Churches: Their Doctrine and  
Fellowship.  
How to Begin the Study of New Testament Greek, II.  
How Men Get their Sermons.  
Successful Preaching.  
Moses: His Life and its Lessons, XII.  
The Labor War.  
Exploring the Bible; Variety and Unity.

## THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW.

Philadelphia, July, 1893.

The Trial of Servetus.  
Theological Thought among French Protestants in  
1892.  
Homiletical Aspects of the Fatherhood of God.  
Failure of the Papal Assumption of Boniface VIII.  
Metrical Theories as to Old Testament Poetry.

John Greenleaf Whittier.  
Baptized for the Dead.  
How Were the Four Gospels Composed?  
The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.  
Some Recent German Discussions on Inspiration.

## THE PRESBYTERIAN QUARTERLY.

Richmond, Va., July, 1893.

Natural Religion and the Gospel.  
The True and the Fictitious Jesuits.  
The Way of Peace.  
The Book of Esther.  
Voluntary Societies and the Churches.

## THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL REVIEW.

Virginia, July, 1893.

The Movement toward Religious Reformation  
among the Latin Races in Europe, 1863-75.  
The Validity of Swedish Orders.  
The Survival of Christianity.  
A Modern Red-Cross Knight.  
The Charges of Bishop Thirlwall.

## THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW.

Philadelphia, July, 1893.

The Dishonesty of Heresy.  
Scholastic and Mystic Theology in the Middle Ages.  
Lay Work and How to Secure it.  
The Reformed Church in the United States.  
Evolution and Christian Ethics.  
The Value of the Individual.  
The Benefits of True Scepticism.

## THE REVIEW OF THE CHURCHES.

London, July, 1893.

The Progress of the Churches.  
The Inner History of Wesleyan Missionary Controversy.  
The World's Parliament of Religions.  
The Celebration of the Jubilee of the Free Church  
of Scotland.  
Programme of the Reunion Conference.

## THE SUNDAY MAGAZINE.

Edinburgh, London, Dublin, July, 1893.

Under the Northern Lights.  
A Model Bishop of the New World.  
The Moor.  
At a Wayside Station.  
That Fine Carriage.  
Dr. Newman Hall at Home.  
Russian Dissenters and the Russian Government.  
Jubilee Remembrances, III.  
In the Light of Jesus.

## THE TREASURY.

New York, July, 1893.

The Temptation of Jesus.  
The Gospel of Hope and Help.  
The Lazy Church.  
The Power of Diligence.  
The Crucifixion of Christ.  
Honesty in the Pulpit.  
W. F. Markwick.  
George Washington: His Life and its Lessons.

## MONTHLY BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS LITERATURE, CHRONICLE, OBITUARY, AND CALENDAR.

COMPILED BY THE REV. GEORGE W. GILMORE, M.A.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY.

[Any of these books may be ordered through the  
Christian Literature Co.]

*Aeneodata Oxoniensa: Semitic Series.* Vol. I.,  
Part 5. Palestinian version of the Holy Scriptures.  
Edited by G. H. Gwilliam. London: Frowde, 1893  
4to, 6s.

**Annales** du musée Guimet. (Bibliothèque d'études T. 3 : Mānava dharma cāstra : les Lois de Manou. Traduites du sanskrit par G. Strebley, professeur au lycée Montaigne. 8vo. [Also] T. 24 : le Zend Avesta. Traduction nouvelle, avec commentaire historique et philologique, par James Darmesteter, professeur au Collège de France. 3<sup>e</sup> volume : Origines de la littérature et de la religion zoroastriennes, appendice à la traduction de l'Avesta (fragments des Nasks perdus et index). 4<sup>o</sup>. Paris : Leroux, 1893. Pp. xxiii, 405; civii, 267, 15 fr. et 20 fr.

**Appia, H.** L'Épître de Saint-Paul aux Éphésiens. Lausanne : Bridel, 1893. Pp. 32, 12mo, 50 cents.

**Astrup, H.** Skrift og kirke. Et Vidnesbyrd om og for sand Lutherdom. Christiania : Steens, 1893. Pp. ii, 63, 8vo.

**Aulard, F. A.** Science, Patrie, Religion. Conférence. Paris : Colin, 1893. Pp. 68, 16mo.

**Autremont, Faustin d'**. Étude sur la renaissance islamique et les puissances chrétiennes à la fin du XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. Paris : Notezette, 1893. Pp. 57, 8vo.

**Baentsch, Bruno, Dr.** Das Heiligkeit-Gesetz Lev. xvii.-xxvi. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung. Erfurt : Götter, 1893. Pp. vii, 153, 8vo, 4 mk.

**Baillie, D.** Cottage Readings for Sundays. London : Skellington, 1893. 12mo, 1s. 6d.

**Bamford, J. M.** Christ in the City. London : Kelly, 1893. Pp. 246, p. 8vo, 3s.

**Bang, A. C.** Dokumenter og studier vedrørende den Lutheriske katekismus' historie i Norden kirker. I. Christiania : 1893. Pp. 284, 8vo. [4.50 mk.]

**Banks, Louis Albert, D. D.** Common Folk's Religion. A volume of sermons and addresses. Boston : Lee, 1893. Pp. 343, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Barraud, A., l'abbé.** Chrétien et Homme célèbre au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle. 1<sup>e</sup> série. Tours : Mame, 1893. Pp. 191, 8vo.

**Bardowicz, Leo, Rabbi Dr.** Die rationale Schriftauslegung des Maimonides und die dabei in Bezug kommenden philosophischen Anschaunungen desselben, Darstellung und Beliechtung der von Maimonides versuchten rationalen Begründung der biblischen Vorschriften. Wien : Lippe, 1893. Pp. 59, 8vo, 80 pf.

**Barrels, Fr.** Die Sittenlehre der evangelisch-lutherischen Kirche, nach deren Bekenntnisschriften zusammenhängend dargestellt. Hannover-Linden : Manz, 1893. Pp. viii, 131, 8vo, 9 mk.

**Barth, J.** Etymologische Studien zum semitischen, insbesondere zum hebräischen Lexikon. Leipzig : Hinrichs, 1893. Pp. iv, 76, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

**Beale, S. Sophia.** The Churches of Paris : from Clovis to Charles X. With illustrations by the author from original sketches, photographs and engravings. London : Allen, 1893. Pp. 330, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**Beecher, Henry Ward, Rev.** The Original Plymouth Pulpit Sermons of —, in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn ; from stenographic notes by T. J. Ellinwood. New ed., 10 volumes in 5. Vol. 4, including vol. 7 and 8 of old series, September, 1871, to September, 1872. New York : Fords, 1893. Pp. 503, 480, 8vo, cloth, \$12.50 the set.

**Berry, Joseph F., D.D.** Four Wonderful Years, A sketch of the origin, growth and working plans of the Epworth League ; with an introduction by the Rev. William Ingraham Haven. New York : Meth. Bk. Conc., 1893. Pp. vii, 121, 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**Besant, Annie.** Death—and After ? London : Theosophical Society, 1893. Pp. 86, 16mo, 1s.

**Biedenkapp, George.** Beiträge zu den Problemen des Selbstbewusstseins, der Willensfreiheit und der Gesetzmäßigkeit des Geistes, teilweise mit Bezug auf die Philosophie der Dissertation. Halle a. S. : Fock, 1893. Pp. 64, 8vo, 1 mk.

**Bienemann, Frdr. Jun., Dr.** Werden und Wachsen einer deutschen Kolonie in Süd-Russland. Geschichte der evangelisch-lutherischen Gemeinde zu Odessa. Odessa : Hoerschelmann, 1893. Pp. x, 400, 8vo, 5mk.

**Bikélas, D.** La Grèce byzantine et moderne. Essais historiques. Paris : Firmin Didot, 1893. Pp. viii, 437, 8vo.

**Blok, P. J.** De Jesuiten. Eene rede. Groningen : Wolters, 1893. Pp. iv, 56, 8vo, 75 fr.

**Bompas, Bishop of Selkirk.** Northern Lights on the Bible, drawn from a Bishop's Experiences during Twenty-five Years in the Great Northwest. London : Nisbet, 1893. Pp. 213, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Bourchenien, Daniel.** La Trace du pessimisme dans la société et les lettres francaises contemporaines. Deux conférences prononcées à Montauban par —, pasteur de l'Église réformée de Sauveterre. I. : Les origines. Paris : Grassart, 1893. Pp. 110, 18mo.

**Bovon, J.** Théologie du Nouveau Testament. Tome I. La vie et l'enseignement de Jésus. Lausanne : Bridel, 1893. Pp. 550, 8vo, 10 fr.

**Brandt, W., Dr.** Die evangelische Geschichte und der Ursprung des Christentums auf Grund einer Kritik der Berichte über das Leiden und die Auferstehung Jesu. Leipzig : Reishland, 1893. Pp. xvi, 380, 8vo, 11 mk.

**Briggs, Prof.** The Defence of — before the General Assembly. The case against Prof. Briggs. Part III. New York : Scribners, 1893. Pp. 311, 8vo, 75 cents.

**Buber, Salomon.** Agadischer Kommentar zum Pentateuch, nach einer Handschrift aus Aleppo zum 1. Male herausgegeben und mit Erläuterungen versehen. (In hebräische Sprache). Wien : Lippe, 1893. Pp. xv, 192, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Budé, E. de.** Vie de Jacob Vernet, théologien genevois (1697-1789). Lausanne : Bridel, 1893. Pp. 304, 8vo, 3.50 fr.

**Bullarium Trajectense. Tomi II.** Fasciculus I. Haag : Nijhoff, 1893. 5.70 mk.

**Burdett-Coutts, Baroness.** Woman's Mission. A series of Congress Papers on the Philanthropic Work of Women. By eminent writers. Arranged and edited, with a preface and notes. New York : Scribners, 1893. Pp. xxiv, 485, 8vo, \$3.50.

**Cathrein, Victor, S. J.** Moralphilosophie. Eine wissenschaftliche Darlegung der sittlichen einschließlich der rechtlichen Ordnung. 2. Auflage, 2 Bände. Freiburg i. Br. : Herder, 1893. 8vo, 15.50 mk.

**Charles, Mrs. Rundle.** Early Christian Missions of Ireland, Scotland and England. London : S. P. C. K., 1893. Pp. 422, p. 8vo, 4s.

**Charles, R. H.** The Book of Enoch. Translated from Professor Dilliman's Ethiopic Text, amended and revised in accordance with hitherto uncollected Ethiopic MSS., and with the Gizeh and other Greek and Latin fragments, which are here included in full ; edited, with introduction, notes, appendices and indices. London : Frowde, 1893. Pp. 380, 8vo, 16s.

**Charles, Henry Theodore, Rev.** Bible Eschatology : Its Relation to the current Presbyterian Standards and the Basic Principles that must underlie their Revision. Being a review of the writings of the Presbyterian divine, L. C. Baker. Supplemented by an occasional thesis by Mr. Baker on the eschatology of the Church of the future. Boston : Lee, 1893. Pp. xiv, 241, 12mo, \$1.00.

**Cheyne, T. K., D.D.** Founders of Old Testament Criticism : Biographical, Descriptive and Critical Studies. London : Methuen & New York : Scribners, 1893. Pp. 370, p. 8vo, 7s. 6d., \$2.00.

**Clemen, Carl, Dr.** *Die Chronologie der paulinischea Briefe, aufs Neue untersucht.* Halle a. S.: Niemeyer, 1893. Pp. viii, 293, 8vo, 6 mk.

**Clifford, J.** *The Christian Certainties: Discourses and Addresses on Exposition and Defence of the Christian Faith.* London: Isbister, 1893. Pp. 300, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Corpus Scriptorum latinorum, editum consilio et impensis academicis litterarum caesareae Vindobonensis.** Vol. XXVIII. L. Cell Firmiani Lectantii opera omnia. Accedunt carmina eius que feruntur et L. Cæcili, qui inscriptus est de mortibus persecutorum liber, recensurunt Sam. Brandt et Geo. Laubmann. Partis II, fasc. I. Libri de officio dei et de ira dei. *Carmina fragmenta. Vetera de Lectantio testimonia.* Ed. Sam. Brandt. Prag: Tempaký, 1893. Pp. lxxii, 167, 8vo, 6. 40 mk.

**Cramer, J.** *De betekenis van "het nieuwe Testament" voor den theolog van onzen tld. Redevering, etc.* Utrecht: van Druten, 1893. Pp. 29, 8vo, 50 fl.

**Cremer, H.** *Warum können wir das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis nicht aufgeben.* Zweite Streitschrift zum Kampfe um das Apostolikum. Berlin: Wiegandt, 1893. Pp. 48, 8vo, 75 pf.

**Cruttwell, C. T.** *A Literary History of Early Christianity, including the Fathers and the Chief Heretical Writers of the Anti-Nicene Period, for the use of students and general readers, 2 vols.* London: Griffin; New York: Scribners, 1893. Pp. 606, 8vo, 21s. \$6.00.

**Dadmunt, John H.** *Spiritualism Examined and Refuted.* Philadelphia: privately printed, 1893. Pp. 468, 8vo, \$1.50.

**Dankó, Jos.** *Vetus hymnarium ecclesiasticum Hungarie.* Budapestin, 1893. Pp. xv, 598, 8vo, 20 mk.

**Defaut, André, Abbé.** *L'Eglise de Nice, ses saints et ses œuvres.* Nice: Saint-Pierre, 1893. Pp. 378, 8vo.

**Delisle, Léopold.** *"Incunabula" Biblica, or the first half century of the latin Bible, being a bibliographical account of the various editions of the Latin Bible between 1440 and 1500, with an appendix containing a chronological list of the sixteenth century, by W. A. Copinger.* London: Bernard Quaritch, 1892. Catalogue of the Copinger's collection of editions of the latin Bible, with bibliographical particulars, by W. A. Copinger. . . . Privately printed. Manchester: 1893. 4to. Avec un frontispice et 9 planches." Par Léopold Delisle. 4to. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. Pp. x, 226, avec 54 planches; VIII, 39; et 17.

**De Witt, John D.D.** *What is Inspiration?* A fresh study of the question, with new and discriminative replies. New York: Randolph, 1893. Pp. viii, 187, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Delborg, Ludwig.** *Die St. Marien-kirche der ehemaligen Cistercienser-Abtei Doberan in Mecklenburg und ihre Kunstarbeiten.* Doberan: Theil, 1893. Pp. iv, 100, 8vo, 2.25 mk.

**Dombre, G.** *Essai sur la prédication catholique contemporaine, étude d'homiletique comparée.* Montauban: Granié, 1893. Pp. 77, 8vo.

**Domin, Ludwig.** *Curat an der Metropolitan-kirche zu St. Stephan in Wien. Ein Lebensskizze.* Wien: Norbertus, 1893. Pp. vii, 376, 12mo, 2 mk.

**Dreves, G. M.** *Anrelius Ambrosius "der Vater des Kirchengesangs."* Eine hymnologische Studie. (Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Ergänzungshefte, 58.) Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1893. Pp. vii, 146, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Exell, J. S.** *The Biblical Illustrator: Hebrews, Vol. II.* London: Nisbet, 1893. 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**Eyton, R.** *The Search for God, and other Sermons.* London: Paul, 1893. Pp. 210, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Fischer, Bernhard, Dr.** *Talmud und Schulchan-Aruch. Ein Vortrag für den Leipziger Antisemiten-Verein.* Leipzig: slavische Buchhandlung, 1893. Pp. 110, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Garnier, J.** *Sin and Redemption, 'or, the Spirit and Principle of the Cross of Christ.* London: Stock, 1893. Cr. 8vo, 9s.

**Gauthiez, P.** *Études sur le XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle (Rabelais, Montaigne, Calvin).* Paris: Léclerc, 1893. Pp. xviii, 339, 8vo.

**Gebhardt, E.** *L'Italie mystique. Histoire de la renaissance religieuse au moyen Age.* Paris: Hachette, 1893. Pp. vii, 340, 16mo, 3.50 fr.

**Gebhardt, Oscar von.** *Das Evangelium und die Apokalypse des Petrus.* Die neuentdeckten Bruchstücke nach einer Photographie der Handschrift zu Gizeh in Lichtdruck herausgegeben. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1893. Pp. 92, xx, 8vo, 12.50 mk.

**Gibson, Margaret D.** *How the Codex was Found. A narrative of two visits to Sinai, from Mrs. Lewis's Journals, 1892-93.* London and New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 140, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d., \$1.50.

**Glaube und Busse.** Ein Beitrag zur Beurtheilung neuester Streitfragen von K. W. F. Riga: Hoerschelmann, 1893. Pp. iv, 161, 8vo, 8 mk.

**Gompers, Thdr., Prof., Dr.** *Griechische Denker. Eine Geschichte der antiken Philosophie.* (In 3 Bänden.) 1. Lieferung. Leipzig: Veit, 1893. Pp. 1-96, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Gould, G. M.** *The Meaning and the Method of Life: A Search for Religion. In Botany. London and New York: Putnam, 1893. Cr. 8vo, 9s.*

**Graetz, Henry.** *History of the Jews. Vol. II. From the reign of Hyrcanus (135 B.C.E.) to the completion of the Babylonian Talmud (500 C.E.).* Philadelphia: Jewish Pub. Soc., 1893. Pp. x, 656, 8vo, \$3.00.

**Guirey, George, Rev.** *The Hallowed Day. Fletcher's Prize Essay.* Dartmouth College, 1892. New York: Baker, 1893. Pp. xv, 291, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Hanotaux, Gabriel.** *Histoire du cardinal de Richelieu. I. La jeunesse de Richelieu (1585-1614): la France en 1614.* Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1893. Pp. viii, 556, 8vo, 16 fr.

**Hase, Karl von.** *Werke. 10. Halbband. Heilige und Propheten. 2. Abtheilung. Neue Propheten. Die Jungfrau von Orléans. Savonarol. Das Reich des Wiederaufers.* 3. Auflage. 14. Halbband, 2. Theil. *Gnosis, oder protestantisch-evangelische Glaubenslehre für die Gebildeten in der Gemeinde.* 3. Abtheilung. Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1893. Pp. xxiv, 304, xi, xii, 605-898, 8vo, 10mk.

**Hatch, E., and Redpath, H. A.** *A Concordance to the Septuagint. Part II.* London: Frowde, 1893. Imp. 4to, 21s. New York: Macmillan, \$5.00.

**Hoffmann, M. D., Rabbi.** *Rabboth Machscha-woth, enthaltend biblisch-talmudische Exegesen, Richtigstellung und Erläuterung dunkler Partien im Talmud und Midrasch. II. Band.* (In hebräische Sprache.) Wien: Lippe, 1893. Pp. II, 160, 8vo, 2.20 mk.

**Holst, J. E. von.** *Der Prophet Elias. Ein alt-testamentlicher Geschichts- und Charakterbild.* Riga: Hoerschelmann, 1893. Pp. xiii, 202, 12mo, 2.20 mk.

**Huxley, Thomas H.** *Evolution and Ethics. The Romanes Lectures, 1893, delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre, May 18, 1893.* New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 57, 12mo, cloth, 60 cents.

**Isaacs, A. S.** *Stories from the Rabbis.* London: Osgood, 1893. Pp. 202, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Knabenbauer**, Josephus. *Commentarius in Evangelium secundum Matthaeum*. 2 vols., 8vo. Pars prior. Cap. I.-xlii., complectens: pars altera, cap. xiv.-xxvii., complectens. Paris: Lethieleux, 1893. Pp. 560, 594, 8vo. (*Curseum Scripture, Aucto-ribus, Cornei, Knabenbauer, Hummelauer, et alii.*)

**Kob**, G. Q. *Horatius Flaccus im Licht des Evangeliums*. Die vier Bücher der Oden, deutsch in den Verswesen des Dichters wiedergegeben, und mit Erläuterungen ihres religiös-sittlichen Inhalts versehen. Leipzig: Richter, 1893. Pp. iv., 116, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Koelling**, W. *Die Echtheit von i. John v. 7.* Vortrag. Breslau: Dölffer, 1893. Pp. 48, 8vo, 80 pf.

**Köstlin**, Jul. Prof., Dr. *Die Begründung unserer sittlich-religiösen Überzeugung*. Berlin: Reuther, 1893. Pp. iv., 124, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Kutna**, S. N., Dr. *Die Schöpfungslehre der mosaischen Urkunde innerhalb der Grenzen der bloßen Vernunft*. Studie. Wien: Lippe, 1893. Pp. 70, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

**Langen**, Jos., Prof., Dr. *Geschichte der römischen Kirche von Gregor VII. bis Innocenz III. Quellenmäßig dargestellt*. Bonn: Cohen, 1893. Pp. viii., 720, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

**Lawrence**, A. E. B. *A Churchman to Churchmen*. A series of lectures on matters of controversy at the present day. London: Burnside, 1893. Pp. 112, 12mo, 1s.

**León**, Père. *Vie de saint Bernardin de Sienne, apôtre de l'Italie (1380-1444), de l'ordre des Frères mineurs de l'Observance*. Vanves: Gannereau, 1893. Pp. viii., 312, 16mo.

**Leroy-Beaulieu**, Anatole. *Les Juifs et l'antisémitisme Israélite chez les nations*. Paris: Lévy, 1893. Pp. xi., 446, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

**Levy**, Jul., Prof., Dr. *Historische Erklärung des 2. Theils des Jesaja*. Capitel 40 bis 66, nach den Ergebnissen aus den babylonischen Keilschriften, nebst einer Abhandlung: *Über die Bedeutung des "Knecht Gottes"*. Marburg i. H.: Elwert, 1893. Pp. viii., 160, 8vo, 15 mk.

*Liturgie des Eglises réformées de France*. Projet de révision préparé par la commission synodale de la liturgie pour être soumis à l'examen des synodes particuliers et présenté au prochain synode général. Paris: Fischbacher, 1893. Pp. 207, 8vo.

**Longdale**, J. *Sermons*. Selected and edited by the Rev. Edward L. Bryans. London and New York: Longmans, 1893. Pp. 272, p. 8vo, 6s.

**Lyttelton**, W. H. *The Life of Man after Death*; with remarks on Creation and upon Christian burial. With preface by Rev. E. S. Talbot and *In Memoriam* by Lady Frederick Cavendish. London: Gardner, 1893. Pp. 180, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Macdonald**, E. M. *Design Argument Fallacies*. A refutation of the argument that nature exhibits marks of having been designed by an intelligent being; by the editor of *The Truth Seeker*. New York: Truth Seeker, 1893. Pp. 59, 12mo, paper, 15 cts.

**Mackail**, J. W. *Biblio Innocentum*. Being the story of God's chosen people before the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ upon earth. Written anew for children. London: Reeves, 1893. Pp. 286, p. 8vo, 6s.

**MacLaren**, A. *The Gospel of St. John*. London: Hodder, 1893. Pp. 230, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d.

**Malmström**, A. *Den apostoliske kyrkan och principiatet*. Lund: 1893. Pp. 212, 8vo [3 mk.].

**Marchini**, A. *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae et probatio auctoribus excerptae in usum seminariorum*. Tomi I. und II. Mortara: 1893. Pp. 360, 347, 8vo [7 mk.].

**Meaux**, de. *L'Eglise catholique et la liberté aux Etats-Unis*. Paris: 1893. 12mo, 3.50 fr.

**Meignan**, Les prophétas d'Israël et le Messie depuis Salomon jusqu'à Daniel. Paris: 1893. Pp. 616, 8vo, 7.50 fr.

*Mémoirs publiés par les membres de la mission archéologique française au Caire, sous la direction de M. A. Bouriant*. Tome IX. Fascicule 3. Reprint en hellogravure du manuscrit d'Enoch et des écrits attribués à Saint Pierre avec introduction de M. A. Lods. Paris: Leroux, 1893. Pp. viii., 217-335, pl. I.-XXXIII., 40 fr.

**Merimild**, Cardinal. *Étude sur sa vie, ses œuvres et ses publications*; par le chanoine d'Agéniente. Paris: Delhomme, 1893. Pp. xix., 313, 8vo.

**Merimild**, Cardinal. *Oeuvres de*—. Recueillies et mises en ordre par le R. Père dom A. Grosselle. Eloge et oraisons funèbres. Lyon: Delhomme, 1893. Pp. xxxiv., 584, 8vo.

**Mir**, M. *Historia de la pasión de Jesu-christo*. Madrid: 1893. Pp. 632, 8vo [9.60 mk.].

**Monod**, Adph. *Der Apostel Paulus. Ein Zeuge der Gerechtigkeit und Frucht des Glaubens*. 5 Reden. Witten: Fries, 1893. Pp. viii., 127, 8vo, 1. mk.

**Moosberr**, Th. A. E. *Biedermann nach seiner allgemeinphilosophischen Stellung*. Berlin: Speyer, 1893. Pp. 100, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

**Münch**, G. N. *Die Zarath (Lepra) der hebräischen Bibel*. Einleitung in die Geschichte des Aussatzes. Mit 2 Lichtdrucktafeln. (Dermatologische Studien. Herausgegeben von P. G. Unna.) Hamburg: Voss, 1893. Pp. iv., 167, 8vo, 4.50 mk.

**Murphy**, J. J. *Natural Selection and Spiritual Freedom*. London and New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 268, p. 8vo, 5s. [Essays, theological and philosophical.]

**Myers**, Frederic W. H. *Science and a Future Life*. With other essays. New York: Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 243, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Oliphant**, Mrs. M. O. W. Thomas Chalmers, Preacher, Philosopher, and Statesman. Boston: Houghton, 1893. Pp. 255, 12mo, cloth, \$1.00. (English Leaders of Religion Series.)

**O'Neill**, J. *The Night of the Gods: An Inquiry into Cosmic and Cosmogonic Mythology and Symbolism*. Vol. I. London: Quaritch, 1893. Royal 8vo, 30s.

**Opitz**, Hermann, Dr. *Das apostolische Glanzenbekennen*. Eine Mahnung zur Treue. Wider Harnack. Frankfurt a. M.: Foesser, 1893. Pp. 26, 8vo, 40 pf.

**Parker**, Edwin Pond, Rev. *History of the Second Church of Christ in Hartford*. Hartford: Belknap, 1893. Pp. 435, 8vo, cloth, \$3.00.

**Piatt**, Donn. *Sunday Meditations and Selected Prose Sketches*. Cincinnati: Clarke, 1893. Pp. 448, 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Picard**, Is. *Sermons*. Nancy: Berger-Levrault, 1893. Pp. 305, 16mo, 3.50 fr.

**Pond**, S. W., Jr. *Two Volunteer Missionaries among the Dakotas*; or, the Story of the Labors of Samuel W. and G. H. Pond. Boston: Cong. S. S. and Pub. Soc., 1893. Pp. xii., viii., 273, 12mo, cloth, \$1.25.

**Ponte**, Ludovici de, S. J. *Meditationes, in compendio redacte et magno meditationum numero de precipuis sanctorum festis auctae a Nic. Frizon*. Quas denno edil voluit et prefatione commendavit cœlissimum et reverendissimum dominus Episcopus et Princeps Simon Alchner. Pars. II. Brixen: Presveraria, 1893. Pp. 458, 8vo, 3.20 mk. [I. und II. 7.20 mk.]

**Porter**, Mrs. T. C. *Simon Bar-Jona. The Stone and the Rock*; or, St. Peter and his Confession. Philadelphia: Ref. Ch. Pub. House, 1893. Pp. 221, 8vo, 75 cts.

**Pulpit Commentary** ; Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah. *Exposition by Rev. W. J. Deane* ; Homiletics by Rev. J. Edgar Henry, etc. ; Homilies by various authors. London : Paul : New York : Randolph, 1893. Royal 8vo, 15s. ; \$2.00.

**Putnam, Samuel P.** *Religion a Curse, Religion a Disease, Religion a Lie*. New York : Truth Seeker, 1893. Pp. ii., 96, 12mo, paper, 25 cents.

**Raabe, Richard.** *Die Geschichte des Dominus Māri, eines Apostels des Orients*. Aus dem Syrisch übersetzt und untersucht. Leipzig : Hinrichs, 1893. Pp. 63, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Ragey, Prof.** *Hymnarium quotidianum* B. M. V. ex hymnis mediæ evi comparatum. Paris : Lethielleux, 1893. Pp. ii., 471, 8vo, 4.80 mk.

**Rappenhöner, Joseph, Prof., Dr.** *Allgemeine Moraltheologie*. 2. Theil : *Die Lehre über das Sittliche, sittliche Gute, sittliche Böse*. Münster i. W. : Aschendorff, 1893. Pp. iii., 156, 8vo, \$2.25. [Complete, 5 mk.]

**Rauschmaier, Ant.** *Hebräisches Vokabularium für Anfänger*. Mit Grunddelegung semitischer Eigennamen. München : Oldenbourg, 1893. Pp. 37, 8vo, 70 pf.

**Reed, James, Rev.** *Scripture Testimony concerning the Other World in Seven Discourses*. Philadelphia : Am. New-Church Tr. and Pub. Soc., 1893. Pp. iii., 81, 12mo, cloth, 40 cents.

**Bemy, Nahida.** *Culturstudien über das Judentum*. Berlin : Duncker, 1893. Pp. vi., 322, 8vo, 5 mk.

**Revolution dans la société chrétienne** ; par Charles —. Paris : Retaux, 1893. Pp. iv., 451, 18mo.

**Ricard, Mgr. Saint Joseph** : sa vie et sa culte. Paris : Desclée, 1893. Pp. 334, 4to.

**Robinson, C. H.** *The Church and her Teaching*. Addresses delivered in Cornwall. With an introduction by the Lord Bishop of Truro. London and New York : Longmans, 1893. Pp. 84, 12mo, 2s.

**Rooke, T. G.** *Inspiration, and Other Lectures*. Edited by two of his students. Edinburgh : Clark, 1893. Pp. 270, 8vo, 7s. 6d.

**Rothstein, F. W., Prof., Dr.** *Das Hohe Lied*. Ein Vortrag nebst einer mit Anmerkungen versehenen Übersetzung des Hohen Liedes. Halle a. S. : Mühlmann, 1893. Pp. iv., 61, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

**Rubens, W., Dr.** *Das Talmudjudenthum*. Kritische Streifzüg. Nebst einem Anhang über den Talmud. 2. (Titel-) Ausgabe des Buches "Der alte und der neue Glaube in Judenthum". Zürich : Verlags-Magazin, 1893. Pp. iv., 96, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

**Ryley, G. R., and McCandlish, J. M.** *Scotland's Free Church. A historical retrospective and memorial of the disruption, with a summary of Free Church progress and finance, 1843-93*. London : Constable ; New York : Scribners, 1893. Pp. 406, 4to, 10s. 6d. ; \$2.50.

**Scharff, Ernst.** *Die petrinische Strömung der neutestamentlichen Literatur. Untersuchungen über die schriftstellerische Eigentümlichkeit des 1. Petrusbriefs, des Marcusevangeliums und der petrinischen Reden der Apostelgeschichte*. Berlin : Reuther, 1893. Pp. viii., 187, 8vo, 4 mk.

**Scheibe, Max.** *Die Bedeutung der Werturteile für das religiöse Erkennen*. Halle a. S. : Niemeyer, 1893. Pp. 59, 8vo, 2 mk.

**Schöpfer, Aemilian, Prof., Dr.** *Geschichte des Alten Testaments mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das Verhältniss von Bibel und Wissenschaft*. 1. Halbband. Brixen : Pressvereins, 1893. Pp. viii., 240, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Schubert, Hans von., Prof., Dr.** *Die Composition des pseudopetrinischen Evangelien-Fragmentes. Mit einer synoptischen Tabelle als Ergänzungsheft. Das Petrus-Evangelium. Synoptische Tabelle nebst Übersetzung und kritischem Apparate*. Berlin : Reuther, 1893. Pp. xli., 196 ; iv., 31, 8vo, 5 mk.

**Siedenpfeiffer, Karl.** *Der 1. Brief an die Korinther. Uebersetzt und erklärt*. München : Seyberth, 1893. Pp. iii., 54, 8vo, 1.20 mk.

**Shepherd, J. E.** *Christianity, What it is*. Sermons at John Street Chapel. London : Allenson, 1893. Pp. 36, crown 8vo, 6d.

**Sobkowski, Ludwig, Dr.** *Episkopat und Presbyteriat in den ersten christlichen Jahrhunderen*. Würzburg : Göbel, 1893. Pp. xi., 98, 8vo, 1.50 mk.

**Solly, H. S.** *The Gospel According to Mark. A study in the earlier records of the life of Jesus*. London : S. S. Assoc., 1893. Pp. 246, p. 8vo, 3s. 6d. (*Biblical Manuals*.)

**Southe, R.** *Life of Wesley and the Rise and Progress of Methodism*. Edited by Rev. J. A. Atkinson. London : Warne, 1893. Pp. 616, p. 8vo, 2s. (Chandos Classics.)

**Steinmeyer, F. L.** *Beiträge zum Verständniss des johannischen Evangeliums*. VIII. (Schluss.) Die Scheiderede Jesu an den Kreis der Seinen. Berlin : Wiegandt, 1893. Pp. v., 124, 8vo, 2 mk. [Complete, 15.45 mk.]

**Steinschneider, Moritz.** *Die hebräischen Uebersetzungen des Mittelalters und die Juden als Dolmetscher. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des Mittelalters, meist nach handschriftlichen Quellen. Geckrönte Preissschrift der Académie française*. 2. Bände. Berlin : Bibliogr. Bureau, 1893. Pp. xxlii., 1077, 8vo, 30 mk.

**Sthyr, H. V.** *Apostelen Paulus' Breve til Menigheden i Thessalonika, fortolkede og oversatte, Udgivet med Understøttelse af Ministeriet for Kirke- og Undervisningsvæsenet*. Kjøbenhavn : Wroblewski, 1893. Pp. 290, 8vo, 3.75 Kr. [Also] *Andet Breve til Menigheden i Thessalonika, fortolket og oversat*. Kjøbenhavn : Wroblewski, 1893. Pp. 112, 8vo, 1.65 Kr.

**Strong, Josiah, D.D.** *The New Era ; or, the Coming Kingdom*. New York : Baker, 1893. Pp. xvii., 374, 12mo, cloth, 75 cents.

**Stuckenber, J. H. W., D.D.** *The Age and the Church. Being a study of the age and of the adaptation of the Church to its needs*. Hartford: Student Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. 368, 12mo, cloth, \$2.00.

**Suan, Pierre, Père.** *Les Bienheureux Martyrs de Salsette. Rodolphe d'Acquaviva et ses compagnons de la Compagnie de Jésus*. Lille : Brouwer, 1893. Pp. 200, 8vo.

**Sunderland, Jabez T.** *The Bible : its Origin and Growth, and its place among the Sacred Books of the world. With a list of books for study and reference ; with critical comments*. New York : Putnam's, 1893. 12mo, cloth, \$1.50.

**Sweeney, John K., Kirkpatrick, W. J., and Gilmour, H. L.** *Praise in Song. A collection of hymns and sacred melodies adapted for use by Sunday-schools, Endeavor Societies, etc.* Philadelphia : Hood, 1893. Pp. 224, 35 cents.

**Swete, H. B.** *The Akhmin Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter*. Edited with an introduction, notes, and indices. London and New York : Macmillan, 1893. Pp. 96, 8vo, 5s.

## Literary Department.

1920

**Terry, Milton S., D.D.** The Song of Songs. An inspired melodrama, analyzed, translated, and explained. Cincinnati : Cranstone, 1893. Pp. 64, sq. 16mo, leatherette, 25 cts.

**Thalhofer, Valentin, Prof., Dr.** Handbuch der katholischen Liturgik. 2. Band 2. Abteilung. (Theologische Bibliothek, 13. Band, 2. Abteilung.) Freiburg i. Br. : Herder, 1893. Pp. v.-viii., 345-564, 8vo, 2.40 mk.

**Thirion, E.** Morale et Religion. Paris : Flachbacher, 1893. Pp. 450, 18mo.

**Tuck, Robert.** Revelation by Character Illustrated from Old Testament Lives. New York : Ketcham, 1893. Pp. ii., 308, 12mo, cloth, \$2.00.

**Wallace, George R.** Princeton Sketches : The Story of Nassau Hall. With an introduction by Andrew F. West, Ph.D. New York : Putnam, 1893. Pp. xvi., 200, 8vo, \$2.00.

**Walther, Fr., Dr.** Die christliche Glaubenslehre, als Wissenschaft vom Lebensumstund dargestellt. Stuttgart : Kohlhammer, 1893. Pp. viii., 403, 8vo, 6 mk.

**Walworth, C. A., Rev.** Reminiscences of the Right Rev. Edgar P. Wadham, D.D., first bishop of Ogdensburg. Illustrated with a preface, by Bishop H. Gabrieles. New York : Benziger, 1893. 12mo, cloth, \$1.00.

**Webb, Mohammed Alexander Russell.** Islam in America. A brief statement of Mohammedanism and an outline of the American Islamic propaganda. New York : Oriental Pub. Co., 1893. Pp. 70, 8vo, paper, 50 cts.

**Weeks, Stephen Beauregard.** Church and State in North Carolina. Baltimore : Johns Hopkins Press, 1893. Pp. ii., 651, 9, 8vo, paper, 50 cts. (*Johns Hopkins University Studies*, 11th series, Nos. 5, 6.)

**Wildeboer, G.** De letterkunde des Ouden Verbonds naar de tijdsorde van haar ontstaan. Groningen : Wolters, 1893. Pp. viii., 531, 8vo, 5.90 fl.

**Wlislocki, Heinrich von, Dr.** Volksglauben und religiöser Brauch der Magyaren. Dargestellt von. (Darstellungen aus dem Gebiete der nicht-christlichen Religionsgeschichte. VIII. Band.) Münster i. W. : Aschendorff, 1893. Pp. xiv., 171, 8vo, 3 mk.

**Zahn, J. A., Rev.** Catholic Science and Catholic Scientists. Philadelphia : Kilner, 1893. Pp. iii., 217, 12mo, cloth, 75 cts.

**Zöckler, Otto, Prof., Dr.** Biblische und kirchliche Studien. 2. Heft. Diakonen und Evangelikämer. Zur Entwicklung der Kirchen- und Gemeindeämter im Christentum. Mit besonderer Rücksicht auf Sohm. Kielcnzsch. Band 1. München : Beck, 1893. Pp. 107, 8vo, 1.80 mk.

### CHRONICLE.

(Closes on the 9th of each month.)

**June 14.** The nineteenth General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, in Zion Church, Toronto.

**June 22.** Opening of the Eighth Biennial Convention of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the General (Lutheran) Synod, in Omaha, Neb.

**June 23-29.** International Convention of College Young Women, at Northfield, Mass.

**June 22-July 7.** The Kentucky Chautauqua, at Woodland Park, Ky.

**June 25-30.** Irish Wesleyan Methodist Conference, at Cork.

**June 29.** In St. Paul's Cathedral, London, consecration of Rev. John Sheepshanks Bishop of Norwich, Rev. Dr. J. S. Hill, Bishop of Western Equatorial Africa, Rev. Drs. Isaac Oluwole and Charles Phillips, Assistant Bishops of Western Equatorial Africa.

**June 29-July 2.** International Epworth League Conference, at Cleveland, O.

**July 1-9.** World's Student Congress, at Northfield.

**July 5-9.** Twelfth International Christian Endeavor Convention, at Montreal, Canada.

**July 6.** Summer School of Methods of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, at Ocean Grove, N. J.

**July 6-12.** Seventeenth Annual Meeting of the Summer School of the American Institute of Christian Philosophy, at Prohibition Park, Staten Island.

**July 9.** Opening of the Christian Alliance Convention, at Asbury Park, N. J.

**July 11-30.** Ninth Annual Session of the Ocean Grove Sunday-School Assembly.

**July 11.** Beginning of trial of Rev. John Campbell, D.D., Professor of Church History and Apologetics in the Presbyterian College of Canada, for heresy, before the Presbytery of Montreal.

**July 13-16.** Third International Convention of the Baptist Young People's Union of America, at Indianapolis, Ind.

**July 17-22.** Baptist Grove Meeting, at Weirs, N. H.

**July 19-20.** Formation of the American Institute of Christian Sociology, at Chautauqua.

The Rev. Samuel Hart, D.D., has declined his election to the bishopric of Vermont; the Rev. George Hodges, D.D., has been chosen bishop-coadjutor for Oregon, and the Rev. Dr. Cheshire, Jr., D.D., bishop-coadjutor for North Carolina.

The following changes have recently taken place in theological faculties: Prof. W. W. Martin has resigned the chair of Hebrew in Vanderbilt University; Prof. Theodore W. Hopkins has been elected Professor of Church History, and Prof. J. S. Riggs to the chair of Biblical Criticism, in Auburn Theological Seminary; Prof. F. R. Beattie, D.D., now of Columbia Theological Seminary, has been chosen to the Chair of Systematic Theology in the Seminary at Louisville, Ky.; Prof. Albert T. Swing has been appointed Professor of Church History in Oberlin Theological Seminary; Rev. P. J. Searle becomes Professor of Theology in the Seminary at New Brunswick, N. J.; Prof. M. D. Buell becomes Dean and Resident Professor of the School of Theology of Boston University; Rev. Robert W. Rogers, Ph.D., goes as Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in Drew Theological Seminary; Rev. W. F. Oldham, D.D., takes the chair of the English Bible at Albion College, Mich.; and the Rev. John E. Tuttle has been called to the pastorate of the Amherst College Church, which carries with it the chair of Biblical History and Interpretation.

### OBITUARY.

Davis, Rev. Werner Renick (Methodist Episcopal), M.D. (College of Physicians and Surgeons, Cincinnati).

nati), D.D. (Asbury, now DePauw, University), in Baldwin, Kan., June 22, aged 78. His career has been peculiarly picturesque. He was born of Episcopalian parents; so entered Kenyon College; was there converted to Methodism, on this account being so ridiculed by his classmates that he left without taking his degree; he entered the Ohio conference, 1835, and worked in Virginia; preaching there a sermon on "The Jews in Bondage," he stirred up opposition as an abolitionist, was convicted and sent to prison; his friends insisted on the court being reconvened, his sermon was preached before the judge who had condemned him, and who thereupon reversed the decision; he was transferred to the Missouri Conference in 1833; became Professor of Natural Science in McKendree College, 1834; was elected President of Baker College, 1838; became presiding elder of Baldwin City district, 1832; the same year he was chaplain of the 12th Kansas Volunteer Infantry; was made colonel of the 6th Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, 1864; and in 1868 led an expedition against the Indians in the Black Hills. Since that time he has served fourteen years as presiding elder of the Fort Scott, Manhattan, and Topeka districts. Besides attending as delegate the General Conferences of 1868 and 1872, he attended the Ecumenical Conference of London in 1881 and the Centennial Conference of Baltimore, 1884. His position as an instructor has done much for the educational interests of Kansas.

Findley, Rev. William Thornton (Presbyterian), D.D., in Perrineville, N. J., June 14, aged 79. He was graduated from Franklin College, 1833; was licensed by the Second Associate Reformed Synod of Ohio, 1840; engaged in mission work in Dayton, O., 1841; became pastor of the Associate Reformed Church in Chillicothe, O., 1843, part of the time of his stay here being also principal of the Chillicothe Academy; became pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Springfield, O., 1855; and of Presbyterian Church at Xenia, O., 1859; removed to care of the Central Presbyterian Church, Newark, 1869; subsequent to 1881 he accepted charge of the church at Perrineville, where he died. In 1867-68 he edited the *Family Treasure*, a literary and religious magazine. His publications have been confined to sermons and addresses.

Graves, Rev. J. R. (Baptist), D.D., LL.D., near Memphis, Tenn., June 26, aged 73. He did not receive a collegiate education, but qualified himself for his work by indefatigable devotion to study. He became principal of the Kingsville Academy, Ohio, 1839; then of the Clear Creek Academy, Ky., 1841; was called to ordination against his desire, 1845; removed to Nashville, Tenn., the same year, opening a school there; took charge of the Central Baptist Church in that city in the autumn of 1845; became editor of the *Tennessee Baptist*, 1846, eventually raising its circulation to exceed that of any Baptist paper in the world; originated the Southwestern Publishing House for disseminating Baptist literature, 1848; formulated the plan of the Southern Baptist Publication Society in 1870, and in 1874 turned over to it an endowment of \$130,000 which he had raised. In 1853 he was sent by the Domestic Mission Board of his church to found a church in New Orleans, which he did, making it one of the strongest in the South. He has been especially active as a controversialist, having engaged in numerous public discussions on Baptism. He has published "The Desire of All Nations," "The Watchman's Reply," "The Trilemma," "The First Baptist Church in America," "The Little Iron Wheel," "The Great Iron Wheel," "The Bible Doctrine of the Middle Life," "Exposition of Modern Spiritualism," besides numerous other works, as well as editing Wall's "History of Infant Baptism" and Robinson's "History of Baptism."

Gregg, Rt. Rev. Alexander (Protestant Episcopal), D.D. (South Carolina College 1859), in Austin Tex., July 10, aged 74. He studied and practised law in early life, later turning his thoughts to theology. He was ordered deacon in 1846, and priest in 1847; became rector of St. David's Church, Cheraw, S. C., 1846; was consecrated Bishop of

Texas, 1859. He has also acted as trustee and chancellor of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., to the interests of which he was very devoted. He has published a "History of South Carolina," numerous "Charges," "Addresses," and "Sermons," besides contributing some of the most valuable articles to the "Church Cyclopaedia."

Harvey, Rev. Hezekiah (Baptist), D.D. (Colby University, 1861), at Hamilton, N. Y., June 28, aged 72. He was graduated from Madison University, 1845, and from Hamilton Theological Seminary, 1847; became tutor in Madison University, 1847; accepted pastorate of Baptist church at Homer, N. Y., 1849; became pastor at Hamilton, 1857; became Professor of Church History and Pastoral Theology in Hamilton Theological Seminary, 1858; was made Professor of Biblical Criticism and Interpretation and Pastoral Theology, 1863; became pastor of First Baptist Church, Dayton, O., 1864; returned to Hamilton as supply of church there, 1868; resumed his place in the seminary, 1869; was relieved of his work in the Old Testament in 1875; and in 1891 was relieved of his department of New Testament Interpretation, retaining only the work in Pastoral Theology and performing the duties of Dean of the faculty. He has published a "Biography of the Rev. Alfred Bennett," "The Church," "The Pastor," and the commentary on the Pastoral Epistles and the Epistle to Philemon in the "American Commentary on the New Testament."

Hay, Rev. Charles Augustus (Lutheran General Synod), D.D. (Pennsylvania College, 1859), at Gettysburg, Pa., June 26, aged 73. He was graduated from Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., 1839, and at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in that town, 1841; studied at Berlin and Halle, Germany, until 1843; became pastor of Lutheran church at Middletown, Md., 1844; was called to chair of Hebrew and German in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg the same year; entered the pastorate again at Hanover, 1845; removed to charge of the First Lutheran Church of Harrisburg, 1849; was again called to the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg to teach Hebrew, German, Biblical Criticism, and Pastoral Theology, 1865, since which time he has remained with the seminary. He leaves a wife, three sons, and two daughters. Among his publications are "Life of Captain Sees," a translation of Schmid's "Doctrinal Theology of the Evangelical Lutheran Church," and numerous contributions to the *Bibliotheca Sacra* and other reviews on critical and practical topics.

#### CALENDAR

*July 15-August 6.* Roman Catholic Summer School, at Plattsburgh, N. Y.

*Aug. 1-18.* World's Conference of Christian Workers, at Northfield, Mass.

*Aug. 11-20.* Sixth Annual Interdenominational Seaside Bible Conference, at Asbury Park, N. J.

*Aug. 31-Sept. 2.* Second World's Sunday-School Convention, at St. Louis, Mo.

*Sept. 2.* Roman Catholic Education Day, at Chicago.

*Sept. 5-9.* Catholic Congress, at Chicago.

*Sept. 6-7.* Convention of the Catholic Young Men's National Union, at Chicago.

*Sept. 11-20.* World's Parliament of Religions, at Chicago.

*Sept. 15-21.* General Missionary Convention of the Disciples of Christ (Christian Evangelist), at Chicago.